DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 150 903 HE 009 637

AUTHOR	Blackburn, Robert T.; And Others
TITLE	Evaluation Report: UW-O FIPSE Project.
PUB DATE	Aug 77
NOTE	185p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$10.03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Bibliographies; *Educational Assessment; Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Innovation; Questionnaires; *Scheduling; *School Calendars; *Semester Division; Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes; *Trimester Schedules; Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*University of Wisconsin Oshkosh

ABSTRACT

The calendar innovation at the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh is evaluated in this FIPSE-supported project. Five objectives are addressed: (1) assessment of changes in campus activities, climate, and attitudes of students, faculty, administrators, and the Oshkosh community; (2) measurement of student and faculty attitudes toward unique instructional formats, teaching strategies, auto-technologies, and calendar time periods; (3) evaluation of student performance in courses with various instructional formats, teaching strategies and auto-technologies; (4) evaluation of the effectiveness of calendar activities in meeting the needs of specific interest groups and types of students; and (5) assessment of the affective responses of faculty to the Faculty Development Program that involves compensation for additional service for curriculum development, research opportunities, and inservice training. The new calendar combines a traditional two-semester system of 17 weeks each and an 8-week summer session with an alternative calendar that divides the fall and spring semester into three modules of 7-7-3 weeks and a summer semester into two 4-week modules. Its impact on students, student learning, faculty, supportive services, and administration is described. Its accomplishments regarding attracting nontraditional students, fiscal stability, institutional image, etc. are also assessed. A bibliography and questionnaires are appended. (LBH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED150903

EVALUATION REPORT

UW-O FIPSE PROJECT

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert T. Blackburn
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Prepared by:

Robert T. Blackburn
University of Michigan

Ellen C. Armstrong
Rutgers State University

Marie D. Dykes
Wayne State University

HE009637

August, 1977

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE i

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND AND SETTING 2

III. METHODOLOGY AND DATA SOURCES 10

IV. FINDINGS 15

  A. Impact on Students

  B. Student Learning

  C. Impact on Faculty

  D. Consequences for Supportive Services

  E. Impact on Administration

V. DISCUSSION 68

  A. Some Limitations

  B. Goal Accomplishment

    1. Attract "New" (Nontraditional) Students
    2. Allow Faculty Development
    3. Achieve Fiscal Stability
    4. Enhance Staff Flexibility
    5. Increase Faculty Research Output
    6. Improve Student Performance
    7. Increase Curricular Innovation
    8. Change UW-O Image

VI. SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND FUTURE NEEDS 83

BIBLIOGRAPHY 92

APPENDICES 97

PREFACE

As students of higher education, assessing the University of Wisconsin - Oshkosh was a rare treat. Not often can one find an academic laboratory of this magnitude where a change had impacted on as many facets of the institution as UW-O's new calendar has done. Size alone does not account for all of the complexities we encountered in our evaluation, but the scope of the operation certainly was a critical dimension. We simply did not have the resources to encompass all that was going on.

Separating events from their causes also created difficulties for us. Not all of the changes taking place were consequences of the calendar reform. No doubt some will differ from us in the assignation of reasons to the events which occurred and which are still transpiring. There is more to be learned at UW-O than is contained in this report.

As for the future and for parts of what is not contained in this evaluation, we are happy to announce that other products are forthcoming. Two of these are Ph.D. dissertations by two of the authors: Ellen Armstrong, "Impacts of Calendar Reform on University Support Systems," and Marie Draper Dykes, "Organizational and Individual Influences on Faculty Participation in the Implementation of a University Innovation." Both (public) documents will be available in Fall, 1977. Articles will be prepared by all three of us. Some will be directed toward the general audience of higher education and others will be prepared for research journals. We also hope that others at Oshkosh who are working on phases of the changes at the University will join us in collecting all that has been learned and in collaborating on a book.

We owe thanks and appreciation to many who assisted us in our work--digging out and supplying data, meeting airplanes and chauffering around town, arranging interviews and making appointments, feeding and housing us--a lengthy agenda of important matters necessary for the conduct of an inquiry such as this. Even a long list would slight someone, and so we mention no one--save Sam Adams, our FIPSE Project Director, who did all of those things and more.

Robert T. Blackburn
Professor of Higher Education
Center for the Study of Higher Education

Ellen C. Armstrong
Doctoral Candidate
Center for the Study of Higher Education
University of Michigan

Marie Draper Dykes
Assistant Provost for Academic Programs
and Assistant Professor, College of
Nursing, Wayne State University

Ann Arbor, Michigan
August, 1977

I. INTRODUCTION

The charges we accepted in assuming the responsibility for evaluating the calendar innovation are spelled out in the Abstract of the FIPSE proposal (Appendix A) and in the contract (Appendix B) we signed with UW-O. The Abstract states the following five objectives:

"1. To assess changes in campus activities, climate, and attitudes of students, faculty, administrators, and the Oshkosh community as a result of calendar implementation.

2. To measure student and faculty attitudes toward unique instructional formats, teaching strategies, auto-technologies, and calendar time periods.

3. To evaluate student performance in courses with various instructional formats, teaching strategies and auto-technologies.

4. To evaluate the effectiveness of calendar activities in meeting the needs of specific student interest groups, part-time adult learners, commuting students, "drop-in"--"drop-out" students, ethnic minorities, veterans, etc.

5. To assess the affective responses of faculty to the Faculty Development Program which involves compensation for additional service for curriculum development, research opportunities, and inservice training."

Our contract with UW-O specifies in more detail responsibilities and obligations but does not alter in a substantive way the five objectives stated in the FIPSE Abstract.

II. BACKGROUND AND SETTING*

The University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh began in 1865 as Oshkosh Normal School. It, too, passed through the same stages as did other of Dunham's (1969) colleges of the "Forgotten Americans." Along with the rest of the system of normal schools in the state, UW-O became in succession Wisconsin State Teachers College in 1927, Wisconsin State College in 1951, Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh in 1965, and received its current title in 1971 as the state merged its various postsecondary institutions into a single system headquartered in Madison.

Until the fairly recent past, UW-O had been a comparatively small school. It was not until 1955 that enrollment exceeded 1,000 students. The significant growth spurt occurred in the sixties, when the enrollment grew from slightly over 2,000 in 1959 to 11,500 in 1970. The number of full-time faculty expanded at about an equal rate, increasing more than six-fold--from 100 in 1959 to 677 in 1971. The maximum numbers of both students and faculty peaked a couple of years ahead of similar developing universities. The earlier than usual enrollment declines are the precipitators of the UW-O Calendar Plan, the innovation being evaluated here.

To understand the events surrounding the calendar change, it is necessary to set UW-O in context--its ecology, clientele, staff, mission, and leadership. To begin, Oshkosh's 50,000 residents have an immigrant background, people purposely brought to work for the lumber barons who developed the city and surrounding area. While the city is economically healthy in terms of employment, it still reflects its founding as a have/have not community.

---

* This section is based upon UW-O announcements and Harry L. Peterson's (1976) dissertation. Peterson's work was of great assistance to us, for his inquiry focused on the events up to and including the adoption of the calendar change. His personal time with us is also appreciated.

Moreover, neither the well-to-do nor the working class have ever formed an effective alliance with UW-O. In contrast to some other college towns, the rich have not been strong UW-O supporters, financially or culturally, and the poor have not been traditional attendees. UW-O's student population has a high proportion of first generation college enrollees, a significant fact when it comes to recruiting nontraditional (particularly older) students, for they will be less likely to have had contact with colleges and will be more difficult to attract. In addition, the Fox River Valley area has a long history of political conservatism, people who view universities at best with a great deal of suspicion. Senator Joseph McCarthy's strongest vote-getting was in this county. The first Black family did not move into Oshkosh until the 1960's, another indication of the typical value pattern and the lack of cultural diversity of people in and around Oshkosh. UW-O staff and faculty are Oshkosh's largest group of the city's smaller than normal middle class.

While admission standards sorted out high school graduates ranking low in their class, UW-O has never been a highly selective institution. (Now UW-O alone, among the state system's four-year colleges, has an open admission policy.) Moreover, in Wisconsin the legal limit for purchasing beer has been at county option. That UW-O found itself in a wet environment contributed to its reputation as a party school and partly accounted for its rapid growth in the 1960's when Wisconsin teenagers were choosing the state college they wanted to attend. Student behavior during this period did little to create a favorable relationship between the gown and town. (Today the relationship is neither hostile nor warm.)

At the same time, growth during the 1960's challenged the traditional teacher preparation mission of the institution. The College of Education remained strong during the decade, but has since suffered greatly from falling enrollments. On the other hand, the other two professional units, the College of Nursing and the College of Business, are new and are the university's healthiest vis-a-vis student demand. It was the College of Letters and Sciences, however, which increased dramatically during the growth period and still has over half of the faculty positions. (Within this College, uneven student enrollments have created problems. The Economics Department, for example, flourishes as it serves business majors, whereas Humanities Departments have staffing problems due to requirement eliminations and student switches to career education.) Faculty were recruited from prestigious graduate universities. The expectation and importance (in spirit more than in fact) of conducting research began to rival teaching as criteria for a "successful" faculty career.

While apparently never having been formally approved, there was talk that UW-O was destined to break away from its sister state colleges and follow the route of the Milwaukee branch, joining it and Madison as a doctoral-granting institution. A new mission was rivaling the traditional preparation of elementary and secondary school teachers. All of this, of course, was before the crash, before the disappearance of students who left two high-rise residence halls virtually empty and an institution adrift as to what would and should happen next. There was no returning to the former mission for the market for teachers had drastically declined. Where to go next was the question, and, for many, still is.

These events, along with some catastrophic incidents in the late 1960's--the dismissal of Black students after a demonstration and the celebrated Roth case which stemmed from it, for example--are important also for what they reveal about the leadership and governance of UW-O. From 1931, only two presidents served prior to Chancellor Robert Birnbaum's selection in 1974. Both were much alike in their paternalistic leadership style, one that probably served adequately while the institution and staff were small. This style of making every decision was not, however, well suited for rapid growth and increased complexity. Even as recently as 1968 in a faculty meeting following the Black Thursday incident, the vice president could express his view of Oshkosh professors:

> We should remember the school is like a family and the administration and central administration are the parents and the faculty are the children, and they should accept the decisions which were made in their behalf.

As the above remarks italicize, the Senate had not been an influential body, despite a youthful faculty recruited from research universities where faculty governance affects institutional policy. No doubt the dramatic social and campus events of the late 1960's even further separated the new guard graduate school oriented faculty from the old guard Teacher Training professors who occupied the senior ranks. For the new recruits--almost a majority in less than a decade--heavy teaching and paper loads led to an inadequate publication record that aborted their career aspirations for a position at a more renown institution. Thus, it was not surprising that internal conflicts would result and lead to a faculty morale problem so severe that when the Educational Testing Service's (ETS) Institutional Functioning Inventory (IFI) was administered in the early 1970's, the mean scores were lower than any institution on which ETS had established its norms. Moreover, there was no faculty oligarchy, no set of leaders who could take the faculty along a constructive path. UW-O's future was indeed uncertain.

(The State merged its college and university institutions about this time (adopted in October, 1971; implemented in July, 1974) and a single president in Madison introduced a different layer of controls over individual campuses. While such a shift of the locus of power no doubt contributed to Oshkosh's identity crisis and leadership problems, it does not appear as if this major reorganization of higher education in Wisconsin greatly altered the unfolding events for this troubled institution.)

The badly damaged ship listed even more precariously in 1973 when 22 tenured faculty were laid off because UW-O failed to meet student target projections. And when Birnbaum took the helm in February, 1974, an even more threatening financial storm confronted him than that which had led to the layoffs the year before. That he came from outside the state and system of Wisconsin and not from a teacher education experience alone signaled that drastic measures were in store for UW-O. Dr. Birnbaum's degree is from Columbia University's higher education program and his principal work experiences were in administration in the City University of New York and in the state higher education office in New Jersey. In short, despite his young age, he came prepared to work in a large system, a conflictual one if it had to be, and with knowledge and skills in the problems and running of contemporary colleges and universities.

Birnbaum guided his ship through this storm. Faculty were involved in solving the fiscal crisis and negotiations were successfully conducted with Madison for a livable budget. The fiscal emergency was at least temporarily under control and faculty felt they had participated in achieving their own salvation. At the same time, Birnbaum set the stage for change, quickly informing all constituencies, and especially the faculty, that disaster was still just around the corner unless UW-O took actions to make itself a distinctive institution. Enrollment predictions were displayed and the steep downward curve was easy to read by all parties. Unless UW-O could do something to attract students who would not ordinarily attend Oshkosh, faculty layoffs would become an annual affair.

Several important activities were in process before Birnbaum arrived. They were, however, at quite different stages of development and there was little or no coordination between them. For example, there was a faculty committee studying the academic calendar which, in fact, had already developed potential plans. The committee's main concern seems to have been to start the fall semester early enough so that it would end before Christmas, but not to restructure time so that other outcomes could be achieved. Another group was progressing rapidly with Personalized System Institution (PSI, but called 4-M at UW-O) and several courses, especially in the sciences, had been converted to am audio-tutorial format and had been available to students in the media center.

But it was Birnbaum with a few close associates who took these and other ingredients and created a new recipe to increase UW-O's survival chances in the future. While the new package goes under the title of Calendar Revision, what the chancellor conceptualized were new ways to structure time, the elusive ingredient that haunts academia, especially faculty. (The formal plan is displayed in Appendix A, the Abstract of the FIPSE proposal. The 14-, 7-, and 3-week modules during the regular terms and the 8- and 4-week units during the summer are the calendar components and provide for the variations.)

What has happened in the restructuring of time is that an enterprising faculty can manipulate significant blocks of time. For example, the 3-week blocks serve as a Faculty College period for faculty development as well as a time in which students can take short courses and departments can generate additional student credit hours (SCH). Increasing faculty teaching assignments in one 7-week block can free another block later, or can reduce future assignments so that scholarly work can be done. Continuous registration was facilitated by a highly sophisticated computerized registration process and permitted academic units to increase SCH production and meet productivity targets in new ways (e.g., a student can drop a 14-week course in the 5th week but now add a replacement course for the second 7-week term and lose no credits). Without doubt the most significant creation of the calendar reform was the Faculty Development Program made possible by the $100,000 (matched by the State to produce a total of $200,000) pooled in part from reducing Summer School overload pay from 22 per cent of salary to 15 per cent. The vice-chancellor administers this money through a Faculty

Development Board (primarily a group of elected faculty members). The Board receives faculty proposals to conduct research and/or to undertake curriculum revisions. On a competitive basis, the Board awards grants to faculty in amounts that are either 7 1/2 per cent or else 15 per cent of their salary. In this way, the 7 per cent (about 1/3) of their summer pay, lost by that minority of faculty who had had summer school overloads, made possible financial compensation for many who never could obtain it from the university during the summer. CAS (Compensation for Additional Service) was what set this faculty into motion. The ability to create blocks of time and CAS are the driving forces that emerged from the calendar reform.

The new calendar plan (Appendix A) was developed during the fall, 1974, and voted on favorably by about a 2-to-1 margin of the faculty for a two-year experimental period starting summer, 1975. Many goals were established (see below), including the attraction of students, particularly "new" (non-traditional, i.e., not the 18-year-old right out of high school) students on the basis that the shorter modules and PSI would better mesh with the working schedules of adults. How this and other goals were achieved, and to what degree, are analyzed below in Section IV (Findings) and in Section V (Discussion). Before turning to the impacts of the innovation on nearly every segment of the university, we next report on the data sources available to us and the methodologies we employed.

III. METHODOLOGY AND DATA

Initial visits in late summer and early fall, 1976, allowed us to meet key individuals and to have them come to know us. We wanted to assure ourselves that there was support from the top and that key administrators considered the project a high priority matter. We had to be certain that crucial institutional data were on hand or could be generated by UW-O and made available to us. We wanted to get a sense of the political dynamics of the campus, especially as viewed by faculty members from diverse backgrounds and with varying opinions about the health of the institution and the virtues and limitations of the innovation. We would have liked to know more than we could learn in a preliminary way--from students and staff, for example--but not everything was possible. We did, however, think that we came to have a good enough sense of the university that we could begin to design instruments and set up a schedule of data collection activities. We then returned to the campus in September to appear before the faculty of each of the UW-O Colleges--to introduce ourselves, answer questions about what we were to engage in, solicit future cooperation, and to win trust and support from the various constituencies we were dependent upon for information.

The above preliminaries went extraordinarily well. We had an office in a "neutral" location, a converted home on campus which housed the Testing Center and which was neither an administrative, faculty, or student domicile. We came to know the editors of the student newspaper and had a supportive story in one issue. We slept in a dormitory and ate in the Commons--

to save money, however, rather than to be purposely visible. In short, we became known as legitimate outsiders with an important job to do, professionals who cared about the constituencies of UW-O and the task we were about, persons with whom they should work.

A. UW-O Data Sources

As was mentioned above, we entered the scene a full year after the innovation had been in operation (and about two and one-half years after the idea's inception), too late to direct initial data collection. However, thanks to the good planning of UW-O staff, a number of important sources of data had been tapped fairly early in the total innovation process. For example, the position papers from the chancellor's office provided a background of educational philosophy and goals that later aided our analysis. A number of mini-questionnaires had been developed by a joint faculty/administration Calendar Evaluation Committee and collected by the Office of Planning and the Office of Institutional Research. These questionnaires surveyed students and faculty and gave a quick reaction to different phases of the innovation.*

Catalogs; minutes of 13 calendar committees; meetings with the institutional faculty, staff, and student Calendar Evaluation Committee (and later its report to the UW-O community); planning documents from the vice-chancellor's office; data from the Research Associate working on faculty development under a Lilly Endowment grant; routine and special computer runs from Institutional Research; State of Wisconsin public documents (salaries, for example); student surveys; ETS's IGI and IFI instruments; and a host of other written records were made available to us. They serve as insights into the state of affairs over the period of the innovation and as baselines for some of our analyses.

---

* The results of these "mini-Qs" are detailed in a report by UW-O's internal Calendar Evaluation Committee and are not repeated here.

B. University of Michigan Evaluation Data

From various institutional and individual documents and conversations we composed a Goal Matrix (see Appendix C-1) and distributed it to 24 representatives of UW-O constituencies on and off campus. The results of this survey serve to organize the section on Goal Accomplishment (Part V below).

A faculty questionnaire (see Appendix C-2) was used to interview over 100 faculty who were selected at random within groups determined by their degree of participation in the options which resulted from the innovation. There was also a written questionnaire that accompanied the interviews and which was to be returned afterwards. A 99 per cent response rate produced a final population of 99 faculty who provided the principal data for the impact on faculty.

A questionnaire was mailed to 400 students (see Appendix C-3) randomly selected from a pool of graduate students, white undergraduates, and all minority students. The timing of this mailing before the holidays was unfortunate and expected support from the student newspaper failed to materialize. The return rates were low (29%). Hence, the generalizability of the interpretation of these findings is limited and must be read with caution.

A staff questionnaire (see Appendices C-4a and C-4b) and interview schedule were used in each of 20 different support service areas with the chief person and one other individual who had been at UW-O before the innovation was adopted. Here the response rate was 100 per cent. (In two offices changes of personnel made data collection more difficult.) Slightly different questions were asked in interviews with deans and other administrative officers.

A random sample from a selected population of high school counselors was surveyed (see Appendix C-5 for attitudes about UW-O in general and about the virtues and limitations of the calendar change as far as traditional students are concerned. Of the 50 questionnaires mailed, 37 were returned for a 74 per cent rate. This data, along with that collected in a UW-O marketing research class, provide the basis for our assessment of the impact of the innovation on the community external to the university.

Data on student learning came from individual faculty who had kept records of the same courses taught under different formats and/or in different time blocks. Cost estimates were made by the director of university budgets. Lastly, interviews and data came from many offices--budget business, personnel, chancellor, vice-chancellor, planning, public relations, and others.

C. Reliability and Validity

Coding, key punching, and computer runs were conducted in Ann Arbor. The staff checked each other when interview data were coded. In all, we have confidence in the reliability of our data. Its validity, however, is a much more complex matter, especially since we were engaged after the innovation had begun. Goals changed along the way, like all changes in universities, a certain degree of political activity pervades debates. For example, the faculty referendum on whether or not to continue the innovation came during our study. Our principal data, however, purposely had been collected before this event. Nonetheless, we present more of a snapshot of UW-O's innovation than a film running over an extended period of time. We will return to these limitations in our final comments. First, however, the "Findings" and the "Discussion."

IV. FINDINGS

In addition to the many kinds and forms of data made available to us, we undertook four major investigations to obtain answers to the principal questions set by the FIPSE contract. This part of the report is organized around these studies--the impact on students and their learning; impact on faculty; consequences for supportive services; and impact on the administration. Seciton V discusses the findings in terms of the accomplishment of the calendar-related goals UW-O set for itself.

A. Impact on Students

1. Current Students

Student Expectations and Experiences

A questionnaire was used to determine the effect of the calendar changes on students deciding whether to attend UW-O and to ascertain the experiences they have had since enrolling. Student response to the questionnaire was low (29%), and the results must therefore be interpreted with caution. The class breakdown of the sample is representative of the total student body, except for minority students for which the response rate was less than 5%. Table 1 shows selected demographic characteristics of the sample.

Students were asked whether they expected UW-O to offer some 18 different instructional activities (see Table 2), and whether or not they had experienced each at UW-O. As for their experience at UW-O, the majority answered in the affirmative for all except small classes, student-designed courses, interdisciplinary courses, and continuous registration courses. The majority had also experienced all of these activities except small

TABLE 1

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS TO STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

		N	% of Total Sample
Class	N=116		
Freshman		19	16.4
Sophomore		26	22.4
Junior		17	14.7
Senior		19	16.4
Graduate		31	26.7
Special		4	3.4
College	N=116		
Business		27	23.3
Education		44	37.9
Letters & Sciences		35	30.2
Nursing		8	6.9
Undecided		2	1.7
Ethnic Origin	N=116		
White		109	94.0
Black		2	1.7
Native American		4	3.4
Oriental		1	0.9
Age	N=116		
18		14	12.1
19		22	19.0
20		16	13.8
21		15	12.9
22		4	3.4
23-25		14	12.1
26-30		15	12.9
Over 30		16	13.8
Have You Ever Attended a College or University Other Than UW-O?	N=116		
Yes		49	42.2
No		67	57.8
Sex	N=110		
Male		47	42.7
Female		63	57.3
When Did You First Enroll at UW-O?	N=111		
Before June, 1975		52	46.8
After June, 1975		59	53.2

TABLE 2

PERCENT OF TOTAL STUDENT RESPONSES REGARDING EXPECTATION AND EXPERIENCE OF SELECTED INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

Activity	Did You Expect UW-O to Offer This?			Have You Experienced This Since Coming to UW-O?		
	N	Yes%	No%	N	Yes%	No%
1. Small class in which less than 10 students were enrolled	114	40.4	59.6	116	48.3	51.7
2. Large class in which more than 50 students were enrolled	115	84.3	15.7	115	79.1	20.9
3. One-to-one contact with a teacher as part of a course	112	60.7	39.3	115	72.2	27.8
4. Group project as part of a course	112	77.7	22.3	113	65.5	34.5
5. Student-led discussion as part of a course	113	76.1	23.9	115	61.7	38.3
6. Student-designed course	112	39.3	60.7	114	21.9	78.1
7. Individual study project independent of a regular class	113	79.6	20.4	113	41.6	58.4
8. Experiences in your local community as part of a course	112	58.9	41.1	115	37.4	62.6
9. Single course involving instructors or subject materials from more than one department or course	109	45.0	55.0	110	18.2	81.8
10. Experience with a computer as part of a course	111	72.1	27.9	113	30.1	69.9
11. Experience with videotape or TV as part of a course	114	78.1	21.9	115	72.2	27.8
12. Experience with audiotape-recording (e.g., language laboratory) as part of a course	113	77.9	22.1	114	54.4	45.6
13. Laboratory work as part of a science course	114	89.5	10.5	115	72.2	27.8
14. Self-paced learning activities	113	65.5	34.5	114	60.5	39.5
15. Course in which mastery of a unit was required before you could move on to the next unit	112	62.5	37.5	114	59.6	40.4
16. Course in which you were graded on a pass-fail basis	112	59.8	40.2	114	39.5	60.5
17. Course which took less than a full (14-week) semester to complete	113	61.1	38.9	115	69.6	30.4
18. Course for which you could register anytime during a semester	113	30.1	69.9	114	39.5	60.5

classes, student-designed courses, independent study, experience in the community, interdisciplinary courses, use of the computer in a course, pass-fail grading, and continuous registration. Some of these majority "no's" may change as students get closer to graduation. Independent study, for example, may be more common among juniors and seniors than among level 1 students (freshmen and sophomores). In all cases where students had experienced these activities at UW-O, the majority considered that the experience had been of value to them.

Fifty-nine percent of the 41 respondents who entered after the implementation of the calendar reform had been aware of the changes before applying to UW-O. When the expectations of the two groups (those who were aware of the changes and those who were not) are compared, there are a few statistically significant differences. (See Table 3.) Those who were aware of the changes were much less sanguine about finding small classes at UW-O, by almost 25%. On the other hand, they were 25% more likely to expect to experience independent study, and 16% more likely to expect science courses with laboratory work and continuous registration courses. These activities are not unique to the new calendar, but the calendar does seem to have affected student expectations regarding them.

One interesting finding is that whether or not the students expected a particular activity seems to have made a difference in whether or not they experienced it. Those who expected an activity were more likely to have experienced it in 13 of the 18 cases: Small classes, large classes, one-to-one contact with a teacher, group projects, student-led discussions, student-designed courses, independent study, community experience, videotape or TV, audio-tape recording, laboratory work, self-paced courses, and mastery courses. These differences are statistically significant. Although these

TABLE 3

EXPECTATIONS OF STUDENTS AWARE AND UNAWARE OF CALENDAR CHANGES PRIOR TO APPLICATION
(AMONG STUDENTS ENTERING UW-O AFTER JUNE, 1975)

"If you first entered UW-O after the calendar reform was implemented (June, 1975), were you aware of the changes when you applied to UW-O"?

Did you expect UW-O to offer this (activity)?	AWARE			UNAWARE		
	N	Yes%	No%	N	Yes%	No%
1. Small class in which less than 10 students were enrolled	41	24.4	75.6	29	48.3	51.7
2. Large class in which more than 50 students were enrolled	41	87.8	12.2	29	79.3	20.7
3. One-to-one contact with a teacher as part of a course	40	55.0	45.0	28	64.3	35.7
4. Group project as part of a course	40	87.5	12.5	28	71.4	28.6
5. Student-led discussion as part of a course	41	82.9	17.1	28	67.9	32.1
6. Student-designed course	40	50.0	50.0	28	28.6	71.4
7. Individual study project independent of a regular class	41	92.7	7.3	28	67.9	32.1
8. Experiences in your local community as part of a course	40	65.0	35.0	28	57.1	42.9
9. Single course involving instructors or subject materials from more than one class or department	38	52.6	47.4	28	64.4	35.6
10. Experience with a computer as part of a course	39	69.2	30.8	28	78.6	21.4
11. Experience with video-tape or TV as part of a course	41	85.4	14.6	28	85.7	14.3
12. Experience with audio-tape-recording (e.g., language laboratory) as part of a course	41	75.6	24.4	28	82.1	17.9
13. Laboratory work as part of a science course	41	95.1	4.9	28	78.6	21.4
14. Self-paced learning activities	41	70.7	29.3	28	67.9	32.1
15. Course in which mastery of a unit was required before you could move on to the next unit	41	65.9	34.1	28	64.3	35.7
16. Course in which you were graded on a pass-fail basis	40	72.5	27.5	28	60.7	39.3
17. Course which took less than a full (14-week) semester to complete	40	75.0	25.0	28	60.7	39.3
18. Course for which you could register anytime during a semester	41	41.5	58.5	28	25.0	75.0

activities are not related to the calendar only, apparently those who expected a particular experience sought it out to make sure they got it.

Increasing Scheduling Flexibility

It is difficult to determine whether student scheduling flexibility has increased, because there is not very much evidence for a "before and after" comparison. The student questionnaire does, however, provide some opportunity to determine whether the students are at least participating in the various options now.

The majority of student respondents have tried Continuous Registration (CR), 7-, and 3-week courses at least once (53%, 63%, and 64%, respectively). Only 22% have taken at least one 4-week summer course. The students who have taken at least one of the shorter terms, 7, 3, or 4 weeks, are generally satisfied with them: at least two-thirds marked "Satisfied" or "Very Satisfied" with the pacing, amount, workload, and academic achievement for all three course lengths. Nevertheless, 70% of all respondents would prefer 14-week courses, with 7 weeks as a distant second (15%). (See Table 4.)

The questionnaire also sought to assess the effects of the calendar on student employment opportunities and credit loads. Ninety-three percent of the respondents felt that the calendar changes had helped, rather than hindered, them in finding part-time employment. Thirty percent of those who entered UW-O before the changes felt that their credit load (the number of credits for which they registered during the semester) had increased, 24% that it had decreased, and 46% that there had been no change.

Incompletes and Withdrawals

The possibility of registering for some courses any time during the semester--called continuous registration (CR)--would lead one to expect a

TABLE 4

PREFERENCES OF STUDENT RESPONDENTS FOR DIFFERENT TERM-LENGTHS

	1st Choice (N=105)		2nd Choice (N=100)	
	N	%	N	%
14-Week	74	70.5	18	18.0
7-Week	16	15.2	30	30.0
3-Week	1	1.0	25	25.0
4-Week Summer	7	6.7	5	5.0
8-Week Summer	4	3.8	14	14.0
Continuous Registration	3	2.9	8	8.0

great many more Incomplete grades. Two and two-tenths of the student respondents reported at least one outstanding Incomplete in a CR course, but the same percentage reported an Incomplete in a 3-week course. Furthermore, the percentages were higher for longer blocks: 4.3% had an outstanding Incomplete in a 7-week course, and 5% in a 14-week course. The great majority of students (72%) who had attended UW-O before the calendar reform (as well as now) consider that there is no difference in the likelihood that they will take an Incomplete in a course. Twenty percent consider that they are more likely to do so, and 8% that they are less likely.

The students were somewhat more likely to drop a course under the more liberal policy than they were to take an Incomplete. The majority still notice no difference in the likelihood that they will withdraw from a course (61%), but 35% consider themselves more likely to change their schedule by dropping a course, and only 4% less likely. Sixty-three percent of the respondents had dropped no courses during the fall, 1976 semester; 26% had dropped one course; 8% had dropped two; and 3% had dropped three; no one had dropped more than three courses. Of those who dropped a course, almost one-third (32%) subsequently added another course. Of the latter, 72% added only one course, 16% added two, and 13% added three. Fifty-nine percent of those who had dropped a course did so approximately one-quarter of the way into the course, 19% halfway along, 10% three-quarters of the way, and 12% in the first week of the course. The implication of this is that relatively few students were taking advantage of the possibility of dropping a course up until the last week of the term, although the total number of course withdrawals experiennced did increase after the calendar reform was instituted: withdrawals from undergraduate courses, for example, almost doubled between 1973-74 and 1975-76.

Examination of official records on the number of courses dropped each week of the fall, 1976 term indicates that when a student drops a course depends on the time block in question. The pre-calendar policy gave students a little more than half the term to withdraw from a course. Under the new calendar this is equivalent to the eighth week of a 14-week block and the fourth week of a 7-week course. Table 5 indicates the percentage of courses dropped during that part of each block corresponding to the pre-calendar withdrawal period.

Table 6A shows the change in the percentage of Incompletes and withdrawals given in undergraduate courses between 1973 and 1977. The increase in the percentage of course withdrawals is obvious, and may even be under-represented in the table, since the present drop policy allows a student to withdraw from a course during the first week of classes with the enrollment being erased from the record (i.e., no W would appear on the grade report). (A new policy instituting a fee for dropping courses may well reduce these numbers.)

The percentage of Incomplete grades has stayed fairly constant in the past four years, although the number of Incomplete grades has increased.

Table 6B indicates that in the fall of 1975 some courses had quite a high percentage of Incompletes and withdrawals. One course in nine recorded an Incomplete for at least 10% of its students (the average for all courses was an Incomplete for 4% of the students), and one course in 11 recorded withdrawals for at least 35% of the students (the average for all courses was withdrawals for 15% of the students).

Grade Point Averages

In comparing grades for the same course given in different time blocks, courses were used that were taught by the same instructor in more than one block during the fall, 1975 semester. Multiple sections in a single block were combined, and grade point averages were calculated for only those

TABLE 5

PERCENTAGE OF COURSE WITHDRAWALS OCCURRING DURING EACH WEEK OF ALL FALL, 1976 BLOCKS

Week of Semester	% of Drops In 14-Week Term		% of Drops In 1st 7-Week Term		% of Drops In 2nd 7-Week Term		% of Drops In 3-Week Term		% of Drops For 17-Week Term	
1	0.2%									
2	10.1		22.0%						5.3%	
3	7.7		14.8	48.7%*					2.6	
4	6.4	54.2%*	11.9						2.6	
5	9.4		26.3						26.3	44.7%*
6	6.5		16.9							
7	7.4		8.1						2.6	
8	6.5				0.8					
9	4.1				11.5					
10	4.5				7.9	30.5%*			5.3	
11	5.1				10.3				10.5	
12	8.7				18.0				15.8	
13	21.1				46.2				13.2	
14	2.3				5.4					
15							36.9	91.4%*	7.9	
16							54.5		7.9	
17							8.7			
Total	100.0%		100.0%				100.1%		100.0%	
Total No. Drops	6,268		236				312		38	

* Period corresponding to pre-calendar drop period

TABLE 6

A. UNDERGRADUATE COURSE INCOMPLETES AND WITHDRAWALS

	Withdrawals		Incompletes	
	N	%(of all grades)	N	%(of all grades)
Fall 1973	4305	9%	1122	2%
Spring 1974	3326	8	840	2
Fall 1974	4439	10	1123	3
Spring 1975	NA		NA	
Fall 1975	7588	15	1829	4
Spring 1976	6750	15	1535	3
Fall 1976	7680	16	1431	3
Spring 1977	6408	15	1146	3

B. FALL, 1975 COURSE INCOMPLETES AND WITHDRAWALS

Total Number of Course Sections Enrolling at Least 10 Students			1545	
Number of Course Sections Giving Incompletes to at Least 10% of the Students Enrolled			171	(11% of all sections)
14-Week Sections	120	(70%)		
1st 7-Week	11	(6%)		
2nd 7-Week	24	(14%)		
3-Week	16	(9%)		
Number of Cpurse Sections Giving Grades of W (Withdrawal) to at Least 35% of the Students Enrolled			135	(9% of all sections)
14-Week Sections	113	(84%)		
1st 7-Week	3	(2%)		
2nd 7-Week	17	(13%)		
3-Week	2	(2%)		

sections with a total enrollment of at least 10 students.* The results of the comparison, presented in Table 7, are inconclusive, particularly since N's are small, due to the large number of sections enrolling less than 10, but the trends indicate that the 3-week version of a course tends to have a higher GPA than the 14-week or either of the 7-week versions of the same course. Similarly, a course offered in the first 7 weeks tends to have a higher GPA than the same course offered in the second 7-week block. Of the courses offered in multiple blocks, the 14-week version tends to have the greatest percentage of I's: about one-quarter (25%) of these courses had at least 10 I's, with the 3-week version a close second (23%). The 14-week courses also have the greates percentage of W's": 14% of these courses have at least 35% W's, followed closely by the second 7-week block (13%). The 3-week block had no courses with this large a percentage of W's.

Course Offerings

In comparing patterns of course offerings, it must be noted that the spring and fall 3-week terms are not equivalent, at least in the minds of the students, many of whom are anxious to leave early to take summer jobs. UW-O officials reported that student interest in the spring 3-week term was much less than in the previous January interterm.

Table 8 compares patterns of course offerings for spring and fall, 1976 since data were not available to make a fall-fall comparison. Table 8 indicates that there was a tendency to reduce the number of different blocks a course was offered in, although three-quarters of all courses were offered only in the 14-week term, both semesters. There was an increase in the use

---

*This process of combining sections and ignoring those with less than 10 students may distort the actual grade patterns at UW-O, but it was most expedient for comparison purposes. A course enrolling 3 students, for example, and reporting one I, one W, and one A, would have a GPA of 4.00 based on that one person alone, unfairly influencing the unweighted overall GPA for a particular block.

TABLE 7

MEAN GRADE POINT AVERAGE (GPA) FOR COURSES TAUGHT IN MULTIPLE BLOCKS, FALL 1975, AND ENROLLING AT LEAST 10 STUDENTS

BLOCK GPA				
14-Wk	1st 7-Wk	2nd 7-Wk	3-Wk	
3.10	3.41			N = 6 courses
3.05		2.46		N = 14
3.29	3.32	3.34		N = 4
3.18			3.38	N = 26
3.28		3.16	3.37	N = 5
2.88	3.11	3.11	3.00	N = 2
	3.24	3.19		N = 37
	2.17		2.48	N = 1
		2.49	2.64	N = 1
	3.08	2.98	3.17	N = 4

TABLE 8

PATTERNS OF COURSE OFFERINGS, SPRING AND FALL, 1976

	% of Courses Offered in Different Block Combinations	
	Spring 1976	Fall 1976
14-week only	74.9%	75.3%
14 and one 7-week term	2.5	1.3
14 and 3-week	3.9	6.1
14 and both 7-week	1.6	1.4
14, one 7-week, and 3	1.1	0.9
14, both 7-week, and 3	3.2	1.1
one 7-week only	6.9	5.1
both 7-week	1.6	2.3
one 7-week and 3	0.5	0.4
both 7-week and 3	0.3	0.2
3-week only	3.6	5.9
% of courses offered in:		
one block only	85.4%	86.5%
two blocks only	8.5	10.1
three blocks only	2.9	2.5
all four blocks	3.2	1.1

of the 3-week term, both alone and in combination with the 14-week block.

Student Credit Hour Production (SCH)

Table 9 indicates how SCH production for the four colleges and the university as a whole was divided over the different blocks. Although the previous table indicated a decrease in the use of shorter blocks in addition to the full semester (14-week) version of a course, SCH production seems to have shifted more toward the shorter blocks, and especially to the 3-week term. The College of Business evidenced the greatest decrease in the use of 14-week courses (despite a skepticism expressed by members of the Business faculty toward the calendar reform and their own conviction that they do not participate in the various options). The School of Education was the only one to increase its 14-week credit hour production, although it also increased 3-week SCH. Nursing had the greatest investment in shorter blocks during both terms, but 17-week SCH also increased over the period. Fourteen-week courses constituted only one-fifth of all nursing SCH during the fall of 1976. (It should be noted that Nursing had used many 8-week modules under the old calendar (17 weeks/semester) and hence the great number of 7-week courses was not really a consequence of the innovation.)

2. Future Students

We took as one important measure of the university's image the results of a questionnaire sent to high school counselors (the response rate was 74%), feeling that they can influence the college choices of high school students. (The questionnaire can be found in Appendix C-5.) The overall impression given by the results of this survey is that the calendar has had little impact on the image of the university as held by high school counselors.

The most frequently mentioned reason for attending UW-O, for example, was its location, viz., its proximity to home. (See Table 10.) Academic

TABLE 9

STUDENT CREDIT HOUR (SCH) PRODUCTION IN BLOCKS

	Business	Education	Lit. & Sci.	Nursing	All
Spring, 1976	(% of SCH offered in different blocks)				
14-week	83.0%	73.2%	86.4%	33.7%	82.5%
17-week	--	1.2	0.5	2.9	0.7
1st 7-week	5.3	11.8	3.2	33.0	5.6
2nd 7-week	4.2	10.0	4.4	28.6	6.0
3-week	7.5	3.7	5.4	1.9	5.3
Fall, 1976					
14-week	74.4%	79.8%	83.9%	19.9%	80.6%
17-week	--	1.1	0.8	4.4	0.8
1st 7-week	8.0	7.1	2.4	37.8	4.5
2nd 7-week	8.1	6.5	3.8	29.2	5.3
3-week	9.5	5.5	9.1	8.7	8.7

TABLE 10

A. REASONS GIVEN BY HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELORS FOR ATTENDING UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - OSHKOSH

Reason	% of Respondents Mentioning (N = 36)
Location	72.2%
Academic programs	66.7
Personal	19.4
Academic reputation	19.4
Size	13.9
Cost	11.1
Atmosphere, campus, city	11.1
Effective recruiter	2.8

B. REASONS GIVEN BY HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELORS FOR NOT ATTENDING UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - OSHKOSH

Reason	% of Respondents Mentioning (N = 33)
Location	54.5%
Reputation as a party school	30.3
Academic programs	27.3
Academic reputation	18.2
Social problems (drugs, racism)	15.2
City of Oshkosh	9.1
Size	9.1
Friends went elsewhere	6.1
Open admissions	3.0
Wanted out-of-state or private school	3.0

programs were mentioned next most frequently, but they took the form of specific majors and these essentially have not changed since the calendar took effect. The Open Admissions policy was mentioned sixth out of the nine reasons listed, but nothing specifically related to the calendar (e.g., shorter terms, longer work opportunities, graduating earlier, etc.) was mentioned at all.

The reason most frequently given for not attending UW-O was the same, ironically, as the most frequent reason for attending: location. This and the second reason (UW-O's reputation as a party school) are not things that the new calendar can really affect. Again, the calendar itself was not mentioned.

The counselors' responses to the overall impact of the changes on the high school students' perceptions of UW-O were that 30% said UW-O is viewed better; two-thirds said that it is viewed about the same; and one individual (3%) said it is viewed somewhat worse. The responses to the question on open admissions were similar: two-thirds said it makes no difference in attracting higher achieving students. The remainder were about evenly split between "more attractive" and "less attractive."

The counselors were also asked to indicate whether they had heard of 25 specific characteristics of the University. (See Table 11.) Fifteen of these were related to the calendar reform (if not actually part of the calendar itself). Fifty percent or more of the respondents had heard of 10 of these calendar characteristics. The other five calendar characteristics included two with specific relevance to high schools:

TABLE 11

PERCENTAGE OF HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELOR RESPONDENTS WHO HAVE HEARD OF CHARACTERISTICS OF EDUCATION AT UW-O

Characteristic	N	Heard or Know of it Yes%	 No%
1. Complete bachelor's degree in less than 4 years	36	88.9	11.1
2. Self-paced instruction opportunities	35	68.6	31.4
3. Variety in scheduling classes	36	80.6	19.4
4. Special program availability (e.g., nursing, business, . . .)	35	97.1	2.9
5. Provisions for continuous registration	36	44.4	55.6
6. Excellent academic reputation	32	68.8	31.3
7. Short terms (e.g., 7 weeks) allow more flexibility	36	72.2	27.8
8. Media Center	34	52.9	47.1
9. January and May interterms allow for free credits	34	61.8	38.2
10. Extracurricular activities	35	91.4	8.6
11. Closeness to students' homes	35	88.6	11.4
12. Ease of dropping and adding courses	34	55.9	44.1
13. Administrative leadership	34	50.0	50.0
14. Schedule allows for more work opportunities	34	50.0	50.0
15. Dual college and high school credit opportunities	34	47.1	52.9
16. Faculty development program opportunities	34	29.4	70.6
17. Athletic facilities adequacy	34	88.6	11.4
18. Seven-week course alternatives	34	58.8	41.2
19. Housing accommodations availability	35	100.0	
20. Fast computer registration	34	38.2	61.8
21. The city of Oshkosh's cultural, recreational, and employment opportunities	34	82.4	17.6
22. Opportunities for college courses taught at high schools	33	39.4	60.6
23. College courses available at nearby public library	33	24.2	75.8
24. Open admissions	36	86.1	13.9
25. 4-week summer course alternatives	34	64.7	35.3

Characteristic	% which had heard of it	
Dual College and high school credit opportunities	47.1%	(N = 36)
Provisions for continuous registration	44.4	(N = 36)
Opportunities for college courses taught at high schools	39.4	(N = 33)
Fast computer registration	38.2	(N = 34)
Faculty development program	29.4	(N = 34)

The more general characteristics of the university were also more familiar: at least two-thirds of the respondents had heard of "Special program availability"; "Excellent academic reputation"; "Closeness to students' homes": "Athletic facilities adequacy"; "Housing accommodations availability" (100%); and the city of Oshkosh's opportunities. Exactly half had heard of "Administrative leadership." The conclusion to be drawn from this section of the questionnaire is that the counselors' image of UW-O has not undergone much change, but at least word of the various facets of the calendar is getting around.

Most of the 25 characteristics were judged Good to Excellent by the high school counselors. However, more than 30% said only "Fair" or "Unimportant" on five of them:

Characteristic	% responding "Fair" or "Unimportant"	
Ease of dropping and adding courses	37.5%	(N = 24)
Administrative leadership	31.3	(N = 24)
Fast computer registration	35.0	(N = 20)
Oshkosh's opportunities	42.0	(N = 31)
Open admissions	31.0	(N = 29)

The question of the extent to which the 25 characteristics affect a student's decision to attend UW-O produced responses supporting earlier conclusions: according to the counselors, the three characteristics that affect the decision most are closeness to students' homes (53% "Great deal"), special program availability (50%), and the city of Oshkosh's opportunities (48%). The characteristics which have no effect on such a decision again include one relating directly to high schools: college courses available to nearby public library (77% "Not at all," N = 13), opportunitiies for college courses taught at high schools (58%, N = 19), faculty development program opportunities (53%, N = 15), fast computer registration (47%, N = 17), and administrative leadership (35%, N = 20). Of the six characteristics for which any counselor responded "Acts negative," four relate to the calendar (this represents 27% of all calendar-related characteristics): 7-week course alternatives (8%, N = 24), short terms allow more flexibility (7%, N = 27), open admissions (7%, N = 30), ease of dropping and adding courses (5%, N = 22), extracurricular activities (3%, N = 32), and housing accommodations availability (3%, N = 35). These small percentages indicate that the calendar changes have had little negative consequences.

The New Students Division of the university did make an effort during the first year of the innovation to emphasize the new clanedar's flexibility in its recruiting campaigns, but they found that students tended to be confused by opportunities which would not mean anything to them until they had had some experience with college. At present, then, the calendar is nei[illegible] reason to attend UW-O (in the minds of high school counselors) nor a reason not to attend, nor for the counselors is the calendar so far helping the university to meet its goal of an improved image.

Attracting Non-traditional Learners

Unfortunately, there is a lack of evidence on this goal available from UW-O itself, because in some cases pre-calendar figures are not available, and in other cases figures are lacking from 1975 or 1976. One measure of the university's adaptation of its programs to the supposedly greater "new" student cohort is the time of class meetings: older students and those with family or job commitments presumably find it more convenient to take classes offered in the evening, on Saturdays, or off-campus. Figures are available for class times for the fall terms of 1975 and 1976, but not for any term before the initiation of the calendar.

The general conclusion is that UW-O is not making an extensive effort to accommodate atypical schedules, and what effort there is has been decreasing. (See Table 12.) Most departments do offer night classes, but the percentage decreased from 1975 to 1976, as did the percentage offering Saturday classes. The percentage of departments offering classes off campus increased over the period, although the numbers of departments remained the same. The percentage of all courses offered at night rose from 1975 to 1976, but the number decreased. The large decrease in the total number of courses is probably due to the reduction in the numbers of short-block, e.g., 7-week courses, with a smaller increase in the number of 14-week courses (smaller because one 14-week course would take the place of two 7-week courses). Those departments offering any classes at night in 1975 seemed willing to invest in night courses more heavily in 1976, since both the number and percentage of departments offering at least 10% of their courses at night increased from 1975 to 1976. One administrator reported, however, that evening courses are heavily enrolled by regular full-time students who prefer that time period, with the result that spaces must be reserved in night courses for students who are taking those courses only.

3. Characteristics of the Student Body

Perhaps the decrease in night and Saturday classes simply reflects the reality that as yet not enough non-traditional students have been recruited to UW-O. It is unfortunate that there are not figures available

TABLE 12

PERCENTAGE OF COURSES OFFERED AT NIGHT, OFF-CAMPUS, OR ON SATURDAY, FALL 1975 AND FALL, 1976

		1975			1976	
		N	% of Total		N	% of Total
Total No. of Courses	2656			2240		
Courses Offered at Night		216	8		208	9
Courses Offered Off-Campus		73	3		60	3
Courses Offered on Saturday		6	0.2		3	0.1
Total No. of Departments	45			43		
No. Depts. Offering Courses at Night		36	80		31	74
No. Depts. Offering Courses Off-Campus		17	38		17	40
No. Depts. Offering Courses on Saturday		4	9		1	2
No. Depts. Offering at Least 10% of Their Courses at Night		18	40 (50% of all Depts. Offering Courses at Night)		19	44 (61% of all Depts. Offering Courses at Night)
No. Depts. Offering at Least 10% of Their Courses Off-Campus		5	11 (29% of all Depts. Offering Courses Off-Campus)		4	9 (24% of all Depts. Offering Courses Off-Campus)
No. Depts. Offering at Least 10% of Their Courses on Saturday		0	0		1	2 (100% of all Depts. Offering Courses on Saturday)
No. Depts. out of all those offering courses at night that increased % of courses offered at night from 1975-76			19 out of 36 (53%)			
No. Depts. that decreased % of courses offered at night			17 (47%)			
No. Depts. out of all those offering courses off-campus that increased % of courses offered off-campus from 1975-76			6 out of 17 (35%)			
No. Depts. that decreased % of courses offered off-campus			11 (65%)			

to support or refute this possibility. The "Student Statistics" for the University of Wisconsin System did not list age breakdowns until the 1976 edition. For the 1976-77 year, 29% of UW-O's student body was at least 25 years old. This ranked 4th out of the 11 institutions offering graduate work, and 5th out of the 13 four-year institutions. The top percentage was 36, at Milwaukee.

An examination of Table 13 shows that there have been some changes at UW-O over the four-year period 1976-76. The overall percentage of women has stayed constant, but the percentage of women who were enrolled part-time increased greatly between 1973 and 1976. The calendar does not seem to have affected the male/female breakdown, the resident/non-resident relationship (although the percentage of out-of-state undergraduates seems to be decreasing), or the part/full-time ratio. UW-O ranked fourth (out of the 13 four-year UW institutions) in its percentage of part-time students in 1973 and 1976, and fifth in 1974 and 1975. (The minority enrollment has increased over the four-year period. However, minorities are not "new" students as this concept is used.)

Credit Loads

The greatest changes have occurred in the distribution of credit loads: UW-O ranked fifth in the percentage of level 1 (freshman and sophomore) students enrolled for less than 12 credits in 1973, and 4th every year thereafter, but went from last in the percentage of level students enrolled for more than 18 credits in 1973 and 1974 to first in 1975 and 1976. (See Table 13.) Some modification appears to be taking place, however, for both these percentages have been decreasing (i.e., more students are taking 12-18 credits). Again, the percentage of level 1 students taking at least 21 credits went from zero (last) to 1973 in 1973 to 6.4 (first) in 1975, and

TABLE 13

UW-O STUDENT STATISTICS, 1973-1976

	1973	1974	1975	1976
Total enrollment	10,415 (-7.9%)	10,666 (+2.4%)	10,555 (-1.0%)	10,225 (-3.1%)
New Freshmen	1941 (-12.8%)	1730 (-10.9%)	1889 (+9.2%)	1709 (-9.5%)
Undergraduates	9160 (-9.6%)	8632 (-5.8%)	8678 (+.5%)	8451 (-2.6%)
Grad. & Prof.	1255 (+6.9%)	2034 (+62.1%)	1877 (-7.7%)	1774 (-5.5%)
Total FTE	9209 (-8.9%)	8741 (-5.1%)	9301 (+6.4%)	8827 (-5.1%)
Wisconsin residents	94.4%	97.3%	95.8%	96.0%
Non-resident undergraduate	5.8%	4.8%	4.4%	4.2%
% Women	48.9%	48.4%	49.3%	48.6%
Minority enrollment	222	186	224	300
Part-time Men	22.8% (of men)	29.5%	32.1%	30.3%
Part-time Women	19.8% (of women)	30.1%	29.2%	29.4%
Total part-time	21.4%	29.8%	30.7%	29.9%
Level 1 students taking at least 21 credits	0%	0.2%	6.4%	4.2%
Level 2 students taking at least 21 credits	0.2%	0.7%	9.8%	6.1%
Level 1 students taking less than 12 credits	11.4%	14.6%	16.3%	12.8%
Level 2 students taking less than 12 credits	16.0%	18.2%	22.1%	24.8%
Level 1 students taking more than 18 credits	0.8%	1.5%	20.8%	16.2%
Level 2 students taking more than 18 credits	3.4%	4.5%	22.4%	15.4%
Transfers to UW-O	(NA)	535	527	601
Transfers from UW-O	(NA)	423	285	256
Students 19 or younger	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	25.9%
20-24	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	45.2
25-29	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	15.4
30-34	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	6.0
35-39	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	3.1
40-44	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	1.7
45-49	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	1.5
50-54	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	.7
55-59	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	.4
60 or older	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	.2

backed off to 4.2% (still first) in 1976.

Level 2 students (juniors and seniors) showed the same trends: UW-O was sixth in the percentage taking fewer than 12 credits in 1973 and 1974, and fourth in 1975 and 1976. The percentage taking more than 18 credits was next to last in the first two years, first in 1975, but second highest in 1976 (the highest was 18.2%). Almost one student in ten was taking at least 21 credits in 1975, but this percentage went down the following year. The modal credit load was 18 for both 1976 and 1976, so UW-O students are still taking very heavy loads. This is not a statistic which supports the contention that "new" students have been attracted to UW-O, i.e., students with families or full-time jobs, but rather suggests an increased percentage of students who want to finish early.

4. The Transfer Student

For whatever reasons, the transfer student balance has been running increasingly in UW-O's favor over the past three years. Transfers to this institution were 126% of the number of students leaving Oshkosh in 1974, 185% in 1975, and 235% in 1976. Even if UW-O is not attracting an increasing number of non-traditional students, students at other UW universities appear to find it more attractive, and more of the students who enroll at Oshkosh seem to want to stay.

B. Impact on Student Learning

The overall finding here is that different time blocks and different instructional methods seem to have no significantly differential impact on either student learning or student assessment of instruction. Such a generalization needs both evidence and qualification. The former is more difficult to marshall than is the second.

As for the qualifications, the general faculty feeling is just the opposite of the conclusion. Most faculty can see how someone else's material can be taught in shorter time-frames or by machines, but they are equally convinced that there is something inherent in the very nature of their own specialty that makes it impossible for it to be taught and learned in less than 14 (and many still insist, 17) weeks. For their subject, a long digestion period must exist. "A culture can't be grown in a day," they say. What these faculty have in common, and it cuts across all disciplines and colleges, is the belief that what constitutes a course is their covering the material in the classroom. Moreover, they maintain this belief knowing full well that faculty at other colleges and universities teach the same course and use the same book and do it in less time or in other time-frames--e.g., on the quarter system (12 weeks), or in four-week January interterms for those on the 4-1-4 plan, or in other lengths at institutions on trimesters, or that colleagues at UW-O (yea, even themselves) have taught the same course in summer school in 4- or 8-week blocks.

As for the evidence, the literature abounds with "no significant difference" outcomes when various modes of instruction have been scientifically compared. Not surprisingly, that was our finding as well.

We did not have the resources to set up a design that would even sample an adequate number of the possibilities and control for the necessary variables. Instead, we asked for faculty who had data on student learning and on evaluation of teaching for the same course taught in different time-frames or by different means. We obtained cases from different disciplines--in the humanities, natural, and social sciences. (See Appendix C-6.) Our procedure introduces biases inasmuch as those who volunteered their records probably had collected and maintained data because they had a special interest in the outcomes, being either strongly in favor of or strongly opposed to the new calendar.* Also, while in each instance the same final examination was used, the same criteria were used to determine the final grade, or the same evaluation instrument was employed, controlled experiments were not run. For example, those students who selected, say, the 7-week over the 14-week format, may be just the kinds of persons who would do better in each of the two time blocks. There was no randomness in assigning the populations to "experimental" and "control" groups.

Nonetheless, the most defensible generalization is that there is inadequate evidence from which to infer any change in student learning. Some may have learned more, others less, but on the average there appears to have been no pronounced change.

C. Impact on Faculty

Faculty response to the calendar innovation has been remarkable. Over 20 percent of credit hours produced during 1975-76 and Fall 1976-77 were in the alternative time blocks of 7- or 3-week courses and in self-paced courses. In terms of individual involvement, 309 faculty members had taught one or more 7- or 3-week courses. (See Table 14.)

One of the unique features of the alternative calendar options was that they served as a structural focus which could be used to provide alternative faculty assignment patterns. Within the general framework of providing 24 credit hours and 34 weeks of professional service annually, faculty schedules could be manipulated so as to provide released time for faculty during a semester or to increase the number of faculty available during peak enrollment periods. The majority of the faculty continued with the traditional two-

---

*Faculty with disparate findings (if they exist) did not supply them to us.

TABLE 14

NUMBER OF FACULTY WHO TAUGHT 7 AND 3 WEEK COURSES BY COLLEGE THROUGH FALL 1976

FALL 1975 THROUGH FALL 1976

Number By Term

	Total Number All Terms*	1975-76						1976-77
		Fall 1-7 Weeks	Fall 8-14 Weeks	Fall 15-17 Weeks	Spring 1-7 Weeks	Spring 8-14 Weeks	Spring 15-17 Weeks	Fall 1-7 Weeks
Letters & Science	208	77	66	83	59	59	68	56
Nursing	35	17	18	5	17	19	2	21
Business	18	7	6	5	5	5	7	7
Education	48	11	10	21	20	18	8	19
	309	112	100	114	101	101	85	108

* Number may exceed current headcount for unit
Includes faculty who resigned after or during 1975-76 and 1976-77

semester, summer off pattern. By manipulating regular and summer term assignments, other faculty were able to arrange schedules with three-week vacations at the end of Fall and Spring semesters; half semesters off; extended summer vacations; and individualized two-year contracts. Nineteen percent of the faculty in 1975-76 and 17% in 1976-77 had participated in alternative faculty assignment patterns. (See Table 15.)

The other unique feature of the calendar reform, the Faculty Development Program, also was well received. Faculty participation in the research and curriculum development components of the Faculty Development Program (FDP) has more than met expectations. Over one-half of the eligible faculty and academic staff submitted at least one proposal and approximately 70% of these people had at least one project approved. By Fall 1976-77 over 283 curriculum development or research grants had been awarded to 173 different faculty members and there had been a total of 864 enrollments in the Faculty College. In addition, 22 faculty had received awards for off-campus activities.

All in all, over two-thirds of the faculty had been involved in some aspect of calendar reform activities. However, statistics relating to the total numbers of faculty participating say little about any substantial real impact the calendar may have had on faculty throughout the University. To assess this impact, a sample of 100 faculty, stratified by college and participation, was selected for examination. (See Table 16.) For this purpose, all full-time teaching faculty on academic year assignment in the four colleges who were on the faculty prior to January 1, 1974, were considered as part of the faculty population (N = 454). Faculty participants were defined as those faculty who taught at least one course in the 7- or 3-week time block, or who applied for a curriculum development or research award during the 1975-76 academic year or during Fall 1976-77. All other faculty were classified as non-participants. Of the 100 faculty interviewed, 99 returned usable

TABLE 15

FACULTY ASSIGNMENT PATTERNS

	Summer		Fall			Spring			1975-76			1976-77		
	4	4	7	7	3	7	7	3	Number Faculty	Percent		Number Faculty	Percent	
Traditional			X	X	X	X	X	X	414	80.9%		413	82.9%	
3 Week Vacation	X	X	X	X		X	X		38	7.4	19.1%	30	6.0	17.1%
Half Semester Off	X	X	X	X	X			X	24	4.7		7	1.4	
Extended Summer Off		X	X	X	X	X	X		26	5.1		35	7.0	
2 Year Contract - Individualized									10	1.9		13	2.6	
Total									512	100.0%		498	99.9%	

TABLE 16

FACULTY SAMPLE - NUMBER AND PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY COLLEGE AND PARTICIPATION

	Faculty Population		Faculty Sample	
College	Total	Percent	Total	Percent
Education	71	15.6%	16	16.1%
Letters & Science	318	70.0	67	67.6
Nursing	29	6.7	8	8.1
Business Administration	36	7.9	8	8.1
Total	454	100.0%	99	100.0%
Participation				
Participants	352	77.5%	76	76%
Non-Participants	102	22.5%	23	23
Total	454	100.0%	99	100.0%

questionnaires; therefore, sample responses are based on N = 99, and numbers given below are essentially equivalent to percents. Chi square analysis was used to determine statistically significant differences between groups.

Characteristics of the Sample

Using participation as the criterion, respondents were divided into two groups: participants (P) and non-participants (NP). Participants were further divided into three groups according to the nature of their participation in the innovation: (1) both Faculty Development Program and 7- or 3-week course offerings; (2) FDP only; and (3) 7- or 3-week course offerings only.

Demographic Variables

The first set of characteristics examined was demographic variables such as age, faculty rank, highest degree, tenure status, sex, and years at UW-O. (See Table 17.) The only statistically significant difference between participatns and non-participants was in age. Participants were younger than non-participants. Sixty percent of the participants were younger than 45, while 64% of the non-participants were 45 or older. (While this age phenomenon is the common folklore, most studies fail to show that younger faculty are more likely to be adopters of innovations.)

Attitudinal Variables

Attitudinal variables were examined next: agreement with objectives and goals of the calendar and Faculty Development Program, local-cosmopolitan orientation, and teaching-research orientation. (See Table 18.) In addition, two indicators of perceived sources of pressure in faculty responsibilities, derived from questionnaire responses, were examined: quantitative role overload (too many tasks to accomplish) and qualitative role overload (felt need to improve professional skills).

TABLE 17

PROFILE OF FACULTY RESPONDENTS - DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

	Total Respondents	Participants				Non-Participants
	N=99	All Participants N=76	Both N=31	FDP Only N=21	Courses Only N=24	N=23
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Age*						
39 or less	31	36	47	27	35	9
40-44	24	24	20	18	35	26
45-49	14	12	10	14	13	22
50 or more	31	28	23	41	17	42
Rank						
Instructor	6	6	10	0	8	5
Assistant	27	24	20	6	25	35
Associate	42	45	50	8	46	30
Professor	27	25	20	8	21	30
Tenure Status						
Tenured	91	91	90	91	23	87
Non-Tenured	9	9	10	9	1	13
Marital Status						
Single	18	18	27	5	21	17
Married	80	79	70	90	79	83
Other	2	3	3	5	0	0
Sex						
Male	80	82	77	86	83	74
Female	20	18	23	14	17	26
Degree						
Master's	22	21	23	18	21	26
Ph.D.	63	62	57	68	63	65
Ed.D.	9	9	13	0	12	9
Other	6	8	7	14	4	0
Years at UWO						
6 or less	17	17	26	14	17	18
7-9	31	30	26	24	33	32
10-14	40	42	36	48	42	32
15 or more	12	11	12	14	8	4

* Statistically significant at .05.

TABLE 18

PROFILE OF FACULTY RESPONDENTS - ATTITUDINAL VARIABLES

	Total Respondents N=99	Participants				Non Participants N=23
		All Participants N=76	Both N=31	FDP Only N=21	Courses Only N=24	
	%	%		%	%	%
Goal Agreement						
Low	47	38	39	52	33	74
High	53	62	61	48	67	26
Local/Cosmopolitan Orientation						
Local	64	63	71	57	58	65
Cosmopolitan	36	37	29	43	42	35
Teaching/Research Orientation						
Both, but leaning to research	21	22	29	14	21	18
Both, but leaning to teaching	40	40	32	33	54	41
Heavy on teaching	39	38	39	53	25	41
Perceived Sources of Pressures of Work						
Qualitative Overload						
Less	43	43	48	33	54	44
More	57	57	52	67	46	56
Quantitative Overload						
Less	64	61	61	48	71	78
More	35	39	39	52	29	22

* Statistically significant at .05.

There were no statistically significant differences between participants and non-participants on either the cosmopolitan measure or the teaching-research orientation measure. Participants and non-participants tended to have similar attitudes in terms of cosmopolitan orientation, and to share an orientation toward their professional roles irrespective of whether or not they participated in the calendar reform.

There were statistically significant differences between P's and NP's in their agreement with the goals of the alternative calendar and the Faculty Development Program. As would be expected, participants tended to be in high agreement with objectives and goals of the calendar reform. Surprisingly, though, 38% of the participants were in low agreement with calendar objectives. Analysis across the classes of respondents by type of participation revealed no statistically significant differences in the attitudinal and perceived sources of pressure variables.

Faculty were also asked to indicate major sources of satisfaction in their work. The percentages of faculty indicating teaching, research, students, and colleagues are presented in Table 19. One statistically significant measure was that of students as a major source of satisfaction. Non-participants were more likely to indicate students as a major source of satisfaction in their work than participants. There was also a difference in satisfaction with research. Respondents who had participated in the Faculty Development Program indicated more frequently that a major source of satisfaction was research.

Finally, respondents were asked to indicate what influenced their participation or non-participation in calendar reform activities. Responses were collapsed into three categories: (1) Programmatic Needs, e.g., department or curricular requirements; (2) Administrative Influence, e.g., chair-

TABLE 19

PROFILE OF FACULTY RESPONDENTS

Figure 1 - Major Sources of Satisfaction in Work
(By Per Cent of Respondents Mentioning Source)

	Total Respondents	Participants	Both	FDP Only	Courses Only	Non-Participants
	N=99	N=76	N=31	N=21	N=24	N=23
Teaching	46%	45%	39%	67%	33%	48%
Research	20	22	36	24	4	13
Students	39	32	29	24	42	65*
Colleagues	19	20	23	24	13	17

FACTORS INFLUENCING FACULTY

Figure 2 - Participation or Lack of Participation
(By Percent of Respondents Mentioning)

	Total Respondents	All Participants	Both	FDP Only	Courses Only	Non-Participants
Programmatic Needs	33%	40%*	48%	33%	33%	13%*
Administrative Influence	30	30	32	29	29	30
Professional Needs	50	51*	74	71	4	47*

* Statistically significant at .05.

person's or administrator's suggestion; and (3) Professional Needs, e.g., pursue research, scholarly, or curriculum interests. Thirty-three percent of the respondents indicated that their participation or lack of participation was influenced by programmatic needs, 30% by administrative influence, and 50% by professional needs. Professional needs had a statistically significant relation to type of participation. As expected, participants in the Faculty Development Program mentioned more frequently professional needs than programmatic needs or administrative suggestions.

Extent of Participation

Involvement in different aspects of the calendar reform and in related activities was examined to determine the extent of participation by respondents. (See Table 20.) Practically all of the faculty had adapted their courses to either 14-week courses or some combination of 14-, 7-, and 3-week time blocks. However, six faculty continued to offer some courses in the 17-week format. Forty-three percent of the respondents had attended one or more sessions of the Faculty College and 10 respondents had been involved in organizing or presenting a Faculty College session.

Whether or not the faculty member had offered a self-paced course emerged as a statistically significant difference between participants and non-participants. Over 23% of the participants had offered a self-paced course versus 4% of the non-participants. However, only 16% of the total respondents had participated in offering an interdisciplinary course. A greater percentage of participants (54%) applied for curriculum development awards than research awards (47%), but this percentage may be understating the actual number of applications since some faculty submitted multiple proposals. Forty-five percent of the respondents had received compensation for additional service (CAS), including two non-participants who had received CAS for summer courses.

TABLE 20

EXTENT OF FACULTY PARTICIPATION BY ACTIVITY AND BY FIELD
(% Responding Yes)

	Total Respondents	Participants	Non-Participants	Professional Schools	Humanities	Natural Sciences	Social Sciences and Other
	N=99	N=76	N=23	N=32	N=28	N=24	N=15
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Seven week courses	30	30	--	44	29	25	13
Three-week courses	34	45	--	34	43	42	7
Fourteen-week courses	93	92	96	86	26	24	14
Seventeen-week courses	7	8	4	9	7	4	1
PSI/Auto/Self-Paced	19	24	4*	16	39	8	7*
Organized Faculty College	10	13	--	3	11	17	13
Attended Faculty College	43	45	39	44	46	38	47
Applied for Curriculum Development Award	41	54	--	34	39	46	53
Applied for Research Award	36	47	--	22	43	33	60
Received CAS funds	45	57	9	28	46	54	67
Applied for extramural funds	16	21	13	22	11	25	20
Interdisciplinary course	16	17	13	13	21	13	20
Summer inload teaching	18	24	26	31	21	25	13

---

* Statistically significant at .01.

There were no statistically significant differences between participants and non-participants in regard to applications for extramural funding applications and summer inload teaching.

To determine if there were any differences among various units in extent of participation, respondents were divided into four groups according to major disciplinary focus: (1) Professional Schools, (2) Humanities, (3) Natural Sciences, and (4) Social Sciences & Other. Analysis across the four categories of fields revealed three significant associations: Use of PSI or self-paced courses; Research Award Applications; and CAS Funds. Faculty in the Humanities were more likely to be involved in PSI courses (a phenomenon we are unable to explain having expected those who pioneered 4-M, the natural scientists, to be the most involved); faculty in the Professional Schools were less likely to apply for a research award and to receive CAS funds.

Incentives and Barriers to Implementation

Faculty were asked in a number of ways to indicate what they saw as incentives or barriers to the calendar reform. Responses were broad and covered a number of areas. Table 21 summarizes responses mentioned by 20% or more of all respondents and gives the ranking and percentage of the responses by total sample, participants, and non-participants.

Incentives

The more important incentives for faculty participants were factors relating to professional and personal concerns. Schedule or time flexibility for both students and faculty was the most frequent incentive mentioned by all respondents (61%) and by participants (64%). However, non-participants mentioned more frequently (61%) the impact of the calendar on security issues--

TABLE 21

FACULTY RESPONDENTS - PERCEIVED INCENTIVES AND BARRIERS TO IMPLEMENTATION
(% of Respondents Mentioning)

	Total Respondents (N=99)		Participants (N=76)		Non-Participants (N=23)	
	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
Incentives						
Schedule Flexibility	61	1	64	1	52	3
Professional Growth	50	2	49	2	57	2
Security Issues, Budget Stability	46	3	42	4	61	1
Innovative and New	41	4	47	3	22	8*
Faculty Development Program	40	5	42	4	35	5
CAS Funds	37	6	39	5	30	6
SCH Production	32	7	36	6	22	8
Increased Student Options	31	8	26	9	48	4*
Curricular Flexibility	27	9	28	8	26	7
Publications, New Courses, etc.	27	9	30	7	17	9
Barriers						
Increased Rules, Procedures	65	1	65	1	65	2
Conflict and Competition	59	2	57	3	70	1
Increased Demands on Students	58	3	62	2	48	3
Lack of Planning and Coordination	56	4	40	5	70	1
Effect on Academic Standards	44	5	18	10	26	6
Lack Educational Value	42	6	45	4	35	4
Increased Workload	39	7	37	6	48	3
Inadequate Criteria	32	8	33	7	30	5
Lack Resources	31	9	33	7	26	6
Increased Time Pressures	26	10	28	8	22	7
Summer Pay Decrease	21	11	22	9	17	8

*Statistically significant at .05.

such as budget stabilization and faculty layoffs--as an important incentive.

Fifty percent of the respondents agreed that opportunity for professional growth and revitalization was a major incentive for participation. Respondents also saw the Faculty Development Program (40%) and the opportunity to try new and innovative things (41%) as important incentives. The availability of compensation for additional service (CAS) funds was viewed by respondents (37%) as a necessary and critical ingredient for support of faculty calendar-related activities (e.g., development of new courses and curriculum revisions) as well as for support of ongoing professional activities (e.g., research and scholarly pursuits). The availability of institutional funds for professional projects and activities represented a major change for UW-O. Respondents were quick to point out that prior to 1975 only a small amount of institutional funds (less than $15,000 annually) was available for support of faculty projects. In addition, prior to 1976, sabbatical leaves did not exist for UW-O faculty (and still are not a part of the UW system).

The possibility of increased student credit hour production (32%) and increased options for students (31%), e.g., early graduation, ease of coordination with work schedule, etc., were also viewed as incentives for participation on calendar reform activities. The calendar was also seen as encouraging incentives for participation in calendar reform activities. The calendar was also seen as encouraging increased curricular flexibility by respondents (27%). The availability of various time blocks for classes, interest in interdisciplinary courses, experimentation with new scheduling formats for field and laboratory experiences, use of PSI and other self-paced materials, and innovative ways of altering courses were frequently mentioned as positive effects of the calendar on curricular offerings.

There were statistically significant differences between participants and non-participants on two variables: Innovativeness of Calendar and

Increased Student Options. Participants were more likely to see the innovativeness of the calendar as a unique incentive, and non-participants were more likely to see increased student options as an incentive.

Barriers

The major factors seen as barriers to the calendar reform were increased procedures, rules, and regulations, increased accountability of time, and, to a certain degree, decreased autonomy in decision-making. Although most respondents acknowledged that their perceptions might be confounded by the planning process which was initiated shortly after the calendar reform was implemented, over 65% felt that the calendar reform had brought with it increased bureaucratization. As one respondent characterized it, "we have increased options but less choice." At the same time, over 56% of the respondents felt that the lack of adequate planning and coordination has hindered the goals of the calendar reform. For instance, 32% of the respondents felt that the criteria for CAS under the FDP did not meet the needs of all disciplinary groups. Thirty-one percent indicated that lack of resources in terms of equipment, supplies, travel funds, and supportive services was preventing full implementation of the calendar reform.

A prevailing perception was that power had become centered in newly formed groups. Jealousies and feelings of superiority characterized the feelings of some department members toward other departments and colleges. (These sometimes seem to be based on unfounded rumors.) Increased conflict and competitiveness among and between individuals and departments was mentioned by 59% of all respondents.

In regard to impact on faculty time, 39% of the respondents reported that their workload had increased and 26% that time pressures had increased as a result of the calendar reform. Over 21% felt that the summer pay decrease had worked to the faculty's disadvantage by providing less pay for the same work. Schedule alterations, particularly summer inload teaching, were a source of much consternation among some respondents who felt that programmatic needs often took precedence over individual and professional needs.

A more critical set of barriers dealt with the efficiency and effectiveness of the calendar reform in meeting educational goals. Forty-two percent of the respondents questioned the educational advantages of the alternative time blocks, 44% felt that the calendar reform was affecting academic standards negatively, and 58% felt that there were increased demands on the students. Of particular concern was the number of drops and incompletes in courses.* Others felt that some course content was inappropriately being compressed into the alternative time blocks.

There were no statistically significant differences between participants and non-participants on any of the barrier variables.

D. Impact of the Calendar Reform on the University Support Services

The university support systems examined include the New Students Division (Admissions Office), the Registration Office, the Financial Aid Office, the Housing Office, the Central Advising Office, the Veterans Office, the Library, the Media Services, the Computer Center, the Reading/Study Center, the Testing Center, the Health Center, the Counseling Center, the Placement Center, the Union Bookstore, and the Faculty Research Board. All offices were rated by both students and faculty, except that the Housing Office was evaluated by students only, and the Faculty Research Board by faculty only. The Health and Counseling Centers were combined on the faculty questionnaire, but listed separately in the student survey. Faculty members were asked to mark their satisfaction with the offices using a scale of Very Satisfied (V), Somewhat Satisfied (S), Neutral (N), Somewhat Dissatisfied (SD), and Very Dissatisfied (D), while the "neutral" response was omitted on the student questionnaire. For purposes of comparison, only the non-Neutral responses are used in interpreting faculty satisfaction, although had all faculty been forced to choose between V, S, SD, and D, the response pattern might have been different.

---

*See Table 6A above. Faculty are correct about the increase in drops but are in error in the percentage change with respect to incompletes.

Table 22 reports the frequency of response for each option marked by faculty and students, and indicates that both faculty and students are generally satisfied with the service offered by each of the support areas. At least half of the student respondents marked Satisfied or Very Satisfied for all the offices, and at least two-thirds for all except the Housing Office (54% S or V, but 25% D, as well). At least half of the faculty respondents were also satisfied with all the offices except the Library (38% S or V out of the non-Neutral responses) and the Faculty Research Board (46%). The Counseling Center is the support area with which students are most satisfied (45% V), with the Reading/Study Center second (44%). The latter is also the office with which faculty are most satisfied (50% V), with the placement Center second (41% V).

Mean faculty and student satisfaction ratings were compared using an independent t-test. Table 23 presents the mean satisfaction rating of both faculty and students for each office and the statistical significance of the t-test for the difference between those means. It is apparent that while few of the differences are statistically significant, student satisfaction tends to be higher than that of faculty.

The office with which more students have had any contact is the Registration Office (only 4% of the respondents reported "No Contact"), with the

TABLE 22

STUDENT AND FACULTY SATISFACTION WITH UW-O SUPPORT SYSTEMS

	Faculty Responses						Student Responses				
	V	S	N	SD	D	N	V	S	SD	D	N
New Students Division (Admissions)	15.0%	21.7%	41.7%	20.0%	1.7%	60	26.0%	58.4%	10.4%	5.2%	77
Registration Office	21.3	36.0	22.7	16.0	4.0	75	21.3	59.3	11.1	8.3	108
Financial Aid Office	8.8	15.8	57.9	8.8	8.8	57	19.2	48.1	19.2	13.5	52
Central Advising Office	9.9	21.1	38.0	21.1	9.9	71	26.3	52.6	10.5	10.5	19
Veterans Office	--	3.4	96.6	--	--	29	33.3	66.7	--	--	9
Library	8.5	25.3	10.5	29.5	26.3	95	34.6	47.1	10.6	7.7	104
Media Services (AV)	18.8	27.5	15.0	21.3	17.5	80	16.1	54.8	22.6	6.5	31
Computer Center	13.0	33.3	39.1	11.6	2.9	69	31.0	51.7	17.2	--	29
Health Center*	8.9	17.8	57.8	11.1	4.4	45	31.3	54.7	6.3	7.8	64
Counseling Center*	--	--	--	--	--	--	44.8	48.3	3.4	3.4	29
Reading/Study Center	15.4	12.8	69.2	2.6	--	39	43.8	50.0	3.1	3.1	32
Testing Center	22.9	42.2	22.9	9.6	2.4	83	27.9	54.4	17.6	--	68
Placement Center	23.5	23.5	43.1	9.8	--	51	22.7	68.2	9.1	--	22
Union Bookstore	14.3	23.8	35.7	25.0	1.2	84	24.0	54.8	13.5	7.7	104
Faculty Research Board	11.3	14.5	43.5	22.6	8.1	62	--	--	--	--	--
Housing Office	--	--	--	--	--	--	10.7	42.9	21.4	25.0	56

* Health Center and Counseling Center were combined on Faculty Questionnaire.

V = Very Satisfied
S = Somewhat Satisfied
N = Neutral
D = Very Dissatisfied
SD = Somewhat Dissatisfied

TABLE 23

MEAN SATISFACTION RATINGS OF FACULTY AND STUDENTS ON SUPPORT SYSTEMS

	Faculty Mean*	Student Mean	Significance
New Students Division	2.36 (N=22)	3.10 (N=69)	.0000
Registration Office	2.42 (N=31)	2.95 (N=94)	.0012
Financial Aid Office	2.58 (N=24)	2.74 (N=50)	.5103
Central Advising Office	2.50 (N=44)	2.95 (N=19)	.0882
Veterans Office	3.00 (N=1)	3.50 (N=6)	
Library	2.18 (N=85)	3.02 (N=90)	.0000
Media Services	2.56 (N=68)	2.82 (N=28)	.2423
Computer Center	2.93 (N=42)	3.09 (N=23)	.4132
Health Center**	2.74 (N=19)	3.10 (N=60)	(.1007)
Reading/Study Center	3.42 (N=12)	3.30 (N=30)	.6249
Testing Center	3.11 (N=64)	3.11 (N=64)	1.0000
Placement Center	3.24 (N=29)	3.10 (N=21)	.4842
Union Bookstore	2.80 (N=54)	2.90 (N=93)	.4549

* Neutral responses excluded

** Health and Counseling Centers were combined on Faculty Questionnaire

1 = Very Dissatisfied   2 = Somewhat Dissatisfied   3 = Somewhat Satisfied

4 = Very Satisfied

Bookstore and the Library next. The area with which students appear to have had the least contact is the Veterans Office (92% "No Contact"), with Central Advising a surprising second (83%). (While this may be a result of the low student response rate, the representative class breakdown of the sample would lead one to expect that more than a mere 19 of the students had had some contact with the Advising Office (since the likelihood of contact increases with length of time at UW-O).) Theoretically all students are required to consult with an advisor before registering at the beginning of a semester, but the student respondents seem to have found a way to avoid this, if the lack of contact reported by student respondents can be considered an adequate measure. The Placement Center was a close third (81%) in amount of student contact.

Of those students who have had any contact with the support areas, either prior to first enrolling at UW-O, before and since enrolling, or since enrolling only, the Library is the office with which the students have by far the most frequent contact (62% reported frequent contact), and the Bookstore is next (36%). The New Students Division is, not surprisingly, the office with which students have the least contact once they have entered UW-O (71% reported little or no contact), with the Housing Office second (49%).

The Library is also the support area with which faculty report the greatest contact (28% "Very Frequent"), and the Media Center is second (23%). Faculty seem to have very little contact with many of the offices in the general area of student services: over half report little or no contact with the New Students Division (54%), the Financial Aid Office (62%), the Veterans Office (96%), Health and Counseling (70% reporting little or no contact with the combined offices), the Reading/Study Center (78%), and the Placement Center (59%). Exactly half of the faculty also report little or no contact with the Faculty Research Board. Frequency of contact with an office makes no difference in student satisfaction with it, but is related to faculty satisfaction in five out of thirteen cases, although in no easily recognizable pattern.

Faculty were also asked to indicate whether or not their satisfaction with an office had changed since the implementation of the calendar reform, and at least half the respondents noticed no change for all except the Library and the Media Center. Fully 70% were less satisfied with the former, and 59% with the latter. It must be noted, however, that the faculty questionnaire was administered at a time when the Library was undergoing a great deal of restructuring of its own, and feeling was high on campus against some of the changes. More than a quarter of the faculty (27%) were more satisfied with the registration office, and more than 10% were also more satisfied with Central Advising (11%), the Testing Center (13%), the Faculty Research Board (18%) (although this body did not exist per se before the reform, there were committees performing a similar function, awarding grants from small research funds), and the Placement Center (16%). It is difficult to see why this last should be true, as the operations of this office have changed very little over the past two years.

E. Impact Upon Administration

It was difficult to isolate and assess the separate and interactive effects of the calendar reform and changes in administration. Since the arrival of Chancellor Birnbaum in February, 1974, a virtually new administrative staff had been formed. Not only were new offices created, but functions and responsibilities of continuing officers were redistributed. With the implementation of the calendar, much of the energy of these new offices was directed toward establishing and coordinating policies and procedures. During this period of time, new decision-making structures were also formed. The net result was that not only people, but organizational structure as well, changed, making it difficult to separate cause from effect. Thus, while some of the administrative changes in structure and personnel were a consequence of the innovation, others came about because of the new leadership. These interconnections to the innovation would be an interesting study in themselves, but we have not tried to interpret them.

Nevertheless, representatives from each administrative level, executive officers and directors, deans, and department heads, were interviewed to determine perceived impact of the calendar on managerial functions and responsibilities of their offices. The responses from these individuals were varied and represented a wide cross-section of opinion regarding the impact of the calendar. However, two conclusions were immediately apparent. First, there was a sense of enthusiasm among all interviewees about the potential of the calendar for curricular flexibility and faculty revitalization. Second, there was also general consensus among the interviewees that the new calendar called for administrative structures, processes, and procedures that both stabilized and stimulated the institution during the trial period of calendar implementation. Various individuals differed, however, in regard to the degree and nature of administrative coordination necessary to implement institutional goals.

In addition to these two conclusions, there was unanimous agreement that administrative workload has increased appreciably. One of the major increased work activities of administrators involves the large number of combinations and permutations by which faculty can meet their contractual obligations of teaching a normal load (most often 24 credit hours) in 34 weeks. With it now possible to spread the load over a calendar year and teaching commitments of different amounts per term, much more interaction is taking place between deans, faculty, and university administrative offices responsible for monitoring contracts. Scheduling of courss, a corollary of faculty assignments, also consumes many more hours for administrators now than it did before the calendar change. While the interaction with faculty has increased their workload, the deans view this outcome positively. They are interacting with faculty in ways they had not before, are coming to learn their desires and frustrations, and are in general able to help influence individual careers.

Many administrators felt, however, that the locus of general decision-making authority had shifted since the institution of the new calendar. Prior to the calendar reform and the institution of the planning process, faculty, colleges, and other units made uncoordinated demands upon organizational resources. The calendar innovation and the subsequent initiation of the planning process were perceived as providing a focus for relating institutional mission and academic program planning. With that overall focus, administrators at every level found that they had to review program priorities and goals in order to facilitate reallocation of resources among programs. For some administrators this change represented an expansion of authority and control over programs, but for others it was perceived as a threat to program viability and credibility. Concern was expressed by some regarding reconciling the growing tension between autonomy and accountability in curricular and personnel matters. Others felt that current program priorities encouraged program and course proliferation, gimmickry, and duplication, and that tighter "controls" were needed to maintain academic quality.

Another concern expressed by some deans was the lost of effective reward and incentive power. Budget allocations for salary increases are determined by the University of Wisconsin's Central Administration. The major portion of monies available for salary increases is distributed on an across-the-board basis, leaving little or no funds for merit increases. In the past, summer school assignments, overload assignments, and release time were available to provide incentives for faculty. With the establishment of the Faculty Development Program and the availability of CAS funds, many decisions regarding these incentives were made by university-wide bodies, not wholly independent of, but certainly external to, the college.

Increased communication and data needs were perceived by many as a major factor influencing their managerial roles. It was recognized early that there was a need to develop ongoing communication channels through which support, stimulus, and recognition could be provided for faculty, staff, and students as they explored ways of experimenting with the calendar. This need was in part answered by several publications, e.g., The Bulletin, The Advance-Titan, which served as vehicles for disseminating information about projects within the university. The establishment of Context in 1975, published quarterly in a newspaper format and yearly in magazine format, provided considerable visibility and signaled UW-O's intent to reward or publicize activities of the Faculty Development Program. Context, devoted mostly to reporting on faculty, features interviews with faculty, reports on faculty projects, publications, presentations, and recipients of research and curricular development awards, and describes Faculty College sessions.

However, formal publications only addressed one aspect of the increased demands for relaying information and securing feedback on policies, procedures, and actions. Practically all of the interviewees indicated that it was a continuing challenge to keep faculty, staff, and students abreast of changes. Deans and chairpersons were more likely to comment about the necessary, but time-consuming, tasks of scheduling meetings to discuss proposals, solicit reactions and receive recommendations; disseminating memos, announcements, guidelines; meeting deadlines for requests for information; and collecting information to monitor and evaluate schedules, workloads, credit hour productions, and other specific activities of the calendar reform.

In summary, administrators saw the Faculty Development Program and its potential for stimulating faculty growth as the primary strength of the calendar. Although less enthusiastic about the modular time blocks, they also saw increased curricular flexibility as a strength of the calendar. As a result of the implementation of the calendar, the initiation of the planning process, and the administrative reorganization, existing relationships, processes, and procedures had changed. Decisions and structures related to personnel, curricular matters, workload assignments, research service activities, allocations of resources, and support systems had all been effected. Communication needs and the need for coordination with other university units had increased. The impact of these changes across administrative levels was not uniform. Nor was there consensus that the changes resulted in increased centralization or in decentralization. Many of the administrators saw the centralization of policies, procedures, and decision structures as stifling the flexibility that the calendar promised, although they appreciated the increased opportunity for faculty contact. Others welcomed the standardization of policies and procedures as a method of promoting budget stabilization, supporting program priorities, encouraging wider participation in decision-making, and establishing equity among and between colleges and individuals.

V. DISCUSSION

A. Some Limitations

Several factors lead us to believe that the goals for the innovation have changed over time, or, if not the goals themselves, the priorities assigned to each have undergone alteration between their first formulation and today. That they would have is not surprising, for circumstances and people have changed between 1974 and 1977. However, since we were not involved at the innovation's outset and since systematic assessments were not made all along the way, we are unable to trace and document these changes. Our study suffers this limitation.

Second, much has happened at UW-O since the creation of the innovation. However, not all of the changes are traceable to the restructuring of time. As remarked at the outset of this report, there is the danger that we have not always sorted out cause and effect. For example, some of today's activities are simply a consequence of external events--what is going on in higher education across the nation and in the state system in Wisconsin. Internally, the new vice-chancellor was selected in part because of his expertise in planning. The major planning process he introduced impacted heavily on faculty and administrators. So did other new personnel and new organizational structures. We have tried to distinguish between such causes and the effects, but we recognize that not all will agree with our interpretation in each instance.

A third limitation is that some calendar impacts cannot be satisfactorily judged at this moment in time. If the innovation is to have impact on, say, the image of the university and/or the creation of a new mission ("university of alternatives"), these goal accomplishments are not going to be fully visible a mere two years after the innovation became operational. Nor can the goals of developing a flexible faculty or the attainment of regular and significant outside funding for research be judged at this point in time. Hence, these and some other goals cannot be adequately assessed until several years from now.

What these limitations highlight is the need for continuing monitoring of UW-O's innovation. It is important to learn not only whether long-range goals are achieved over time but also to what degree the more immediate impacts have lasting effects.

B. Goal Accomplishment

1. Attract "New" (Nontraditional) Students

This highest priority goal has had the least amount of success. The flaw has not been in the rationale. Providing a variety of time-frames (several of them for shorter intervals) at different points of the year ought to be attractive to older persons, people working at home or at any of a variety of jobs and wanting to increase their skills and knowledge, earn a degree, or whatever. We still think the idea is a sound one.*

The flaw, however, has been in the execution. A new clientele has to know that such an opportunity is available, and it has to be made available at hours other than 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. So far this is not happening to any appreciable extent. There need to be new kinds of offerings--courses and programs to fit the needs of the new clientele, not the regular 8-22 year olds. While the claim was never made that the revised calendar would automatically attract a new clientele, there seems to have been a presumption on the part of many that it would have such a magnetic capacity. The presumption, however, is not true.

---

* We cannot document to the degree we would like that the change in older student enrollment has been minimal. Data are missing. This, however, is our belief.

The regular admissions counselors prepared their brochures around the attractive features of the calendar--less time for a degree, 7-week courses, free January term, early exit in the spring for a better opportunity at summer employment, continuous registration, etc.--but the features meant little to the high school senior or to her or his counselor (see above). The admissions office's promotion material was changed for the following year, giving the calendar but a passing nod.

Whether the administration misread the situation, were too engrossed in the daily new problems of running the innovation within the institution, delegated the responsibility without following up on the matter, or some combination of these factors is not clear. A dean was given this responsibility, but this office failed to meet the challenge. Even today, no one is monitoring the number of new registrants by age. There has been no community survey of needs; little publicity has reached potential clients; the academic deans have come forward with only one new program; offerings of existing programs at hours more likely to attract new students have been minimal; and the many actions one would have expected to have been put into operation for the accomplishment of this highest priority goal have not taken place. (A separate, externally sponsored project taking education to surrounding public libraries has not drawn many students either.)

Only recently has a new person been given the job of attracting "new" students as his primary responsibility. But he has little power, no resources to speak of, and even less staff. For programs he is dependent upon persuading individual faculty to participate, and for no reward other than personal satisfaction. (The problem is further complicated by UW-system policies regarding extension teaching.)

It is going to take a more focused effort than has so far been mustered to achieve this goal. Top administrators are going to have to court the public and make clear to the deans and faculty the importance of this goal. While the chancellor rightfully is trying to have others assume leadership roles and to delegate authority (especially in the academic area, where "new" student programs fall), he, nonetheless, will have to maintain an active role for the accomplishment of this goal.

It may be that the successes of the last two years have lulled the institution into a false sense of security. The budget is balanced for next year, and it has more flexibility within it than any in the recent past. But a university needs students. The shrinking 18-year-old pool will have impact on the entire Wisconsin system. For example, Madison can recruit to capacity despite a drought and will do so at the added expense of the non-doctoral institutions. UW-O needs "new" students just to maintain current enrollment.

There is much to be done in the "new" student area. It should have had detailed attention two years ago instead of just getting off the ground now. Too much of UW-O's future hangs on the institution's attracting new clientele to give this goal anything less than the highest priority and backing.

2. Allow Faculty Development

Without doubt, this second highest priority goal and its accomplishment are the jewel of the innovation. By hard data and by testimony, faculty development has been an outstanding success.*

This is not to say that faculty development is over, for it is a lifelong process. There are always new things to learn in terms of professional development as well as in modes of instruction. For example, if UW-O is successful in attracting non-traditional students, most faculty will have to learn about working with older people. Then there is the continuing problem of trying to involve those who would benefit most from FD but who are also least likely to come forward. And there are others.

---

* IV-C (above) discussed this goal at length. The relevant portions there are not repeated here.

To repeat, though, this goal has had the highest degree of achievement. What makes its accomplishment all the more salutory is that its continual accomplishment is built right into the innovation. FD at UW-O is not a one-shot affair, a sky rocket that will obliterate itself when the first flash is over; rather, FD at UW-O is a regular and ongoing feature of the calendar reform, a bright satellite permanently in orbit.

3. Achieve Fiscal Stability

To the extent that a public institution highly dependent upon the fiscal decisions of a legislature and a governor can establish fiscal stability, UW-O has done so, as of this writing. There are, however, other factors which affect this fine accomplishment all too easily--inflation, for example, as a factor outside the institution's control.

At the same time, the line which links fiscal stability to calendar reform is a thin one. UW-O's budget is basically determined by student enrollment, and, hence, so are the number of staff and faculty positions. As was seen above, enrollments have stabilized but are still forecase to drop, unless a new clientele is recruited. We have seen that as yet the innovation by itself has attracted neither 18-year-olds nor older students to any measurable degree. It must do the latter, for the former pool will unquestionably decline. Following this thread, calendar reform is not the cause of current fiscal stability.

On another strand, however, there is a link between the healthy financial condition at UW-O and the calendar innovation. That connection is with flexibility in staffing, the fourth most important goal and discussed next.

4. Enhance Staff Flexibility

As with a good number of the goal statements made on one or another occasion, different interpretations understandably occur. "Enhancing staff flexibility" has more than average ambiquity associated with it as judged by the responses we received from UW-O personnel. For some enhancing staff flexibility means increasing the repertoire of courses a faculty member can teach, even to the extent of retraining faculty in low student demand areas to teach in disciplines where student enrollment is high. For others, the goal means interdisciplinary teaching. For still others, especially administrators, the goal has an institutional aim and means having faculty available to teach at times of the year institutional and/or program demands dictate. And for some, more than one of these outcomes was what they had in mind.

As for UW-O's achievement of this goal, it is really only the last mentioned interpretation that has been successfully accomplished. It, of course, is not realistic to expect Spanish professors to become economists, even with an effective Faculty Development Program. Nor is it realistic to expect interdisciplinary teaching to be widely practiced. There is some interdisciplinary teaching--the second interpretation of the goal--but as yet it does not seem to be providing the staff flexibility needed for relocating faculty within the institution. But having faculty available at the convenience of the institution, the third interpretation of the goal has been accomplished, and to a significant degree. With their calendar vote, and particularly with the "reaffirmation" vote in spring, 1977, faculty are to be available any contiguous 34 weeks of the calendar year. Said another way, there is no longer the typical academic year with faculty choice to teach or not teach, say, in the summer. Now, if the institution wants to have programs in operation at other than typical (say fall and spring) times, faculty have to work when assigned. It is here that staff flexibility enters and it is through this process that a large share of the CAS funds are generated. By having fewer faculty teaching in the spring when enrollments are down and by assigning them in the summer, overload pay normally used in the summer is banked. (In addition, some faculty who have the bulk of their teaching assignments in the fall and spring (34 weeks) but who teach less than a full load in, say, the spring term, will teach in the summer without compensation so as to teach their typical load for that calendar year. This practice also generates CAS dollars for distribution.)

This is not to say that the university is an ogre and does not consult faculty about their preferences and desires. It does and, indeed, faculty can propose a two-year contract which provides them blocks of time when the individual wants them. Moreover, faculty are encouraged to do so, although few have exercised this option as yet. However, such a request has to be approved, and it will be only if a program is not hurt by the faculty member's absence at a specified time.

Said another way, staffing flexibility was given to the institution by the vote of the faculty who in turn lost some of their personal flexibility. The latter is a serious issue in the eyes of some faculty and remains to be worked out. At this writing it is not possible to predict the magnitude of the discontent or the kinds of solutions that will emerge.

Staff flexibility has also come about from the way tenure decisions are now being made and by the way staff vacancies are filled. Worried about a high percentage of its faculty on tenure and desperately wanting to avoid ever again laying off tenured faculty, UW-O has become stringent in awarding tenured status to individuals. When a person is let go rather than receiving tenure and yet staff are needed in the teaching area, now vacancies are most likely to be filled with part-time faculty or by individuals on "one-year-only" contracts. Both of these procedures have increased the institution's flexibility and indeed are the principal reasons for the financial stability that now exists. From a teaching staff perspective, the administration has increased its flexibility appreciably and can adjust to enrollment shifts much more readily than it could in the past.

To what degree is the calendar reform the cause? Limiting promotions and going to part-time and "one-year-only" academics clearly are options unrelated to the innovation. On the other side, the year-round time periods are a part of the calendar, and so is CAS which, in turn, leads to FD, which is the first kind of staff flexibility talked about above. So cause and effect are really impossible to separate here, as are the gains and losses one makes when comparing the achievement of personal desires which sometimes come in conflict with institutional goals.

5. Increase Faculty Research Output

Tables 16, 17, and 18 in Appendix D of the Internal Evaluation of UW-O's New Calendar (Cox Report) provide data, respectively, on student credit hour production (SCH).

faculty development activities, and dollar grants to the university. The data, however, are mixed and not really appropriate. For example, while there has been a (collective) increase in faculty research proposals submitted, there has been a drop in number of curricular development proposals. Also, the increase in external grant money received is in part related to the calendar, i.e., some funds are specifically for calendar related activities--the Lilly grant, etc., but does not directly alter UW-O faculty productivity (e.g., this FIPSE grant).

What is needed is a random sample of 100 faculty and an examination of their work activity in 1974 vs. 1976. Even then, were published articles to be the measure of productivity (and this is a measure used in most faculty studies), it would be unrealistic to expect an appreciable change in this time span. As research in the social science area has shown, there is an average 50-month lapse between an idea and its appearance in a scholarly journal. (Article acceptance, or even submissions, could be used as an intermediate measure.) It really will be another two years before the calendar impact on faculty scholarly activity can be ascertained with an adequate degree of validity.

6. Improve Student Performance

If student performance and student learning can be equated, we saw above that changed time-frames and instructional methods had little impact on outcomes. (See IV-B and Appendix C-6.) On the other hand, if student performance implies something more than scores on examinations and grades in courses, then the issue is more complex, the evidence is less direct, and the likelihood of immediate answers more remote.

Student performance can mean individual growth on vectors other than in the intellectual and skill domains. Planning one's education, being responsible for meeting requirements, trying new ways of learning and fulfilling obligations, integrating work with study, and relating practice to theory are other dimensions of student performance.

As of now, only two years of new options have been available to students and that is too short a time span to note consequences of these kinds. What can be observed, however, is that students are exercising many of the new options open to them and apparently liking the flexibility the new calendar provides. Their motives may not always be the noble ones many faculty cherish--like "never dropping my course at the last moment, or taking mine in a 3-week slot so as to get it over in the least amount of time because I don't like the subject." However, it seems to us that a university which maximizes student choice, including the opportunity to make poor decisions, is aiding student growth and development and will simultaneously improve student performance (when interpreted on a broad scale).

At the same time, if UW-O is as serious about the importance of this goal as it says it is, then it is time for the university to launch some systematic, ongoing, studies to ascertain degrees of success. Right now the goal of improved student performance is reported to be a regular topic of discussion among the vice-chancellor and deans and the university's principal policy committee of faculty and administrators (CAA). However, plans and their implementation are yet to be put into action. This goal provides an ideal opportunity for the academic and student areas to meet and design ways to assess the degree of its accomplishment. We urge the university to hasten their activity here, to conduct evaluations, and to make their findings known to the larger higher education community.

7. Increase Curricular Innovation

As was detailed at some length in Section IV-C above (Impact on Faculty), the Faculty Development Board received many curricular proposals. Also, the number of courses made available in the media center increased appreciably. In addition, many 3-week and some 7-week courses were new creations and not just the repackaging of the old into a more compressed block of time. In all of these ways this goal has been met.

Naturally faculty were engaged in curricular revision and in working in PSI (the 4-M program, for example) before the innovation as well as after it. We did not try to quantify the rate of such changes nor obtain before and after data, even if it were possible to do so. (It might be, but serious objections could be raised as to whether the invented measures dealt with the essence of innovation.) Rather, our evaluation here rests on faculty testimony and administrator comment. In both cases there is high consensus that this goal has been achieved and that the calendar reform played a principal (if not exclusive) role in bringing about the increase in curricular innovation.

At the same time, since we believe that the successful recruitment of nontraditional students (UW-O's highest priority goal) will call for new courses and new programs not now being offered by the university, there remains much to be done in the way of curricular innovation.

8. Change UW-O Image

As was seen in the student and high school counselor survey (Section IV-A-2), as yet the calendar reform had done little to change UW-O's image. The two surveys conducted by students in the College of Business Administration corroborate this conclusion. (See Appendix C-7 for the Tables in these studies.) At the same time, what the latter surveys reveal is that the image within the city of Oshkosh is not as negative as many on campus seem to think that it is.

Still, there is confusion, internally as well as externally. Administrators and faculty, especially the latter, have had a (largely undeserved) negative self-image for so long that the personal potential the innovation has released understandably has taken many different forms and often tends to flounder rather than to coalesce. A long standing distrust of administration has not been fully erased by the new leadership, despite much more faculty involvement on policy setting bodies and greatly increased sharing of administrative data (budgets, for example).

That there remains unclarity about UW-O's mission--and hence its image--must be frustrating to the chancellor and his staff for the number of documents and speeches made the past three years just on this topic could hardly be matched anywhere else. The message here is that the top administration will have to continue on this as yet incompleted task. It is a long and slow process to change an image, especially one that corresponds to reality and which had been so negative for so many years.

VI. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

Ideas have consequences. The innovation to restructure time at UW-O testifies to this truism.

Without doubt the most striking consequence of the innovation was the increase in the activity level, in the energy expended by faculty, administrators, and staff. (We are not sure that the same claim can be made with regard to students although it appears as if this could be true for them as well, at least in the short calendar periods.) At first glance such an assertion, while important, is not very earth-shattering. On closer inspection, it is, though, for we are talking about having brought about a change not just in the distribution of time but in the total intensity of effort per unit of time. What makes this outcome all the more striking is the fact that this intensity increase has taken place within an occupational group that is already putting in more hours per week than any other professional group and within a profession whose number one complaint and source of stress is that they do not have enough time to accomplish what they have set as goals.

To repeat, the UW-O innovation more than restructured time; it increased the activity level. Here is clearly a case of heightened professional activity as a consequence of the repackaging of a fixed and finite number of hours.

This is not to say that UW-O had a lazy faculty, staff, and administration before the innovation, nor that it had a comfortable one. There was activity--mostly teaching of the same materials by the same persons and in the same ways that they had been doing for a good many years. The education was neither "bad" nor "inferior." It was typical for state U, USA, 1975.

Most faculty in most colleges and universities follow the traditional model, and they are busy. They are the ones cited above, the persons who do not have enough time to achieve their goals and the goals of the institution; they literally are putting in 55 hours per week even if they have very little in the way of scholarly output to show for this extended effort.

What UW-O's innovation triggered was the necessity of rethinking courses in order to deliver them in different time-frames or by different means (PSI). The calendar reform also tempted faculty to compete for additional compensation (CAS) for working on a curricular problem or on a research project, two kinds of activities they desired to do but too infrequently accomplished because of a lack of time and support. Furthermore, through the Faculty College, professors were exposed to new ideas and techniques that would also require time to master if they were to adopt or incorporate them into their way of life. Faculty College ideas led to curricular revisions and to research, additions to a lifestyle that was already fully demanding. The only way new activities could be assimilated into a day that was already full was to increase the pace, to raise the level of intensity.

Increased faculty action is the single major consequence of UW-O's innovation.

Increasing the pace has had both positive and negative consequences. In our view, the former outnumber the latter in importance, and by an appreciable degree. Calendar reform has been a healthy innovation. A fairly complacent and traditional faculty has been tripped into action. Spurred by administrative leaders, faculty are now rethinking curricular and pedagogical matters, and this is good--for all of the obvious reasons. The calendar change alone required this activity on their part. A professor might not have had to strain a great deal to reduce her or his course from 17 to 14 weeks (although our interviews show the agony was appreciable for a surprisingly large number), or to teach the same material at twice the pace in a 7-week block (although an even larger number of faculty say this cannot be done). But to take the typical semester offering and package it for a 3-week stint required major reflection and creation. What are the aims of this course, really? Who needs to do what to accomplish them? A whole host of basic philosophical and psychological questions had to be asked and answered. As we said, these are important and good activities for faculty to be engaged in at regular intervals. It has been too long for too many at Oshkosh (and, of course, at many colleges and universities) since they had.

The Faculty College (made possible by the 3-week blocks that were created when the "normal" semester was changed from 17 to 14 weeks) provided the opportunity to transmit new knowledge and tec-niques to a faculty who needed assistance with their problems--e.g., in how to convert a course to programmed instruction, or on how one area of knowledge can be integrated with another for a cross-disciplinary course. The Faculty College, then, is the second major positive benefit that emerged from the innovation. Faculty development has not been just the catch word of the day but has been built into the ongoing operation of UW-O.

CAS is third of the three outstanding consequences of the restructuring of time. It is a carrot, to be sure, but it is much more than a financial reward. Well over three-fourths of the faculty have interacted with the

Faculty Development Board, the new organization which was created to oversee the $200,000 per year fund for compensating faculty for curricular and scholarly activity. Because the Board is a part of the assistant vice-chancellor's and vice-chancellor's offices, those two individuals have an impact on the direction curricular revisions should take.

What has happened is that a healthy professionalism has been introduced to a large number of faculty who worked in a university but still lived the lives of a teachers college professor. Now there is competition for awards. Peer review has been introduced. Meritocratic principles (in contrast to time on the job) prevail. We judge this consequence to be good (and necessary if the institution is to reverse its predicted slow but steady enrollment decline).

* * * * * * * * * * *

Such a major revision touching as many people and offices as did this calendar change is bound to have had some negative consequences as well. Some were predictable and have been acted upon; others were unintended (but, from hindsight, also were predictable); and still others are yet to appear or are still unpredictable in their long-run effects.

For example, the magnitude of the change and the permutations of scheduling possibilities caused a great deal of confusion. Misinformation substituted for no information, and policies could not always be made in time for needed decisions. Students and faculty have suffered from errors of confusion. These are lessening, however, as practices become known and as manuals are prepared and distributed. There are still gray areas and no doubt some more surprises are yet to surface. The faculty vote to continue the innovation has introduced some new variations and there will be confusion during the transition from the original innovation to what emerges as a legitimate modification. For the most part, however, complexities are solvable problems and not a long-range serious consequence of the innovation.

In the way of unexpected consequences, CAS provides an interesting example. Some faculty were periodically changing their courses, initiating new curricula, converting to media instructional techniques, and the like, as a normal part of their academic life. Such projects faculty did during the regular academic year, or over the summer on their own time. Now they can apply for financial support (up to 15 per cent of their base pay) for doing exactly the same things for which they formerly received no extra compensation. But now, to the surprise of leaders, some faculty who apply for CAS but fail to win an award from the Board are not undertaking their projects. "If others can get paid for doing what they would not have done, why should I do for nothing what I would have done?" is the question they pose. Right now there is not a very good answer to the question. One aspect of the professional faculty member has been tempted by the institutional reward system, certainly not an intended consequence of the champions of the innovation.

Another unexpected consequence was the degree of power which came into the hands of two offices that ordinarily are seen as support services rather than as policy setters and/or makers of academic decisions. The Registrar's Office and the Computing Center have become disproportionately crucial, and hence powerful, in the successful running of the calendar reform. Continuous registration, drops and adds, scheduling, especially in the shorter time blocks, dealing with incomplete grades, providing data for bookstore orders--is a host of ways the Registrar's Office has a significant effect on how the innovation works. While it technically does not set academic policy, the manner in which it implements policy becomes so critical to student careers and institutional practices that in effect the Office determines academic practice.

The Computer Center has come upon its enhanced power because of the high demands placed upon it for service. Many of these demands were generated by the calendar reform (and to some degree by the accompanying planning process). Now a Computer Services Committee hears petitions for services (new programs, for example) because the line is long. Even when the Committee sets priorities (and here is a source of power), a 90-day period exists for their completion or else a candidate has to go through the entire application process again. In one respect having a committee rather than a single individual make priority decisions protects against a "favoritism" practice. In another respect collective power can be even more domineering and dysfunctional. Some offices have been waiting a long time for a service they believe they need.

Another unintended consequence of the innovation has been the physiological and psychological exhaustion it has created for some faculty and staff. Everyone reported an increased workload, and an increase in staff has not accompanied this energy drain. Even the leading innovators on the faculty and staff--the problem solvers who are challenged by confusion--can exhaust themselves and show the strains of a greatly heightened activity level. There is no systematic evidence to support this fear, but its truth must be a matter of concern for those engaged in the management of human beings.

And then there were those who were adamantly opposed to the innovation, some on the basis of principle and others who oppose any change, especially when it is as closely identified with the central administration as this change was. Their frustration level rises. Their energy level also rises, but it is directed towards subversion of rather than to the attainment of innovation's goals.

Unfortunately, there are those who lack the talents needed to meet the occasion. In one way, the faculty development aspect of the innovation was meant for them, but it is highly unlikely that they will ever participate. As a consequence, their inabilities are highlighted rather than kept in the shadows. The potential psychological harm for them could be serious.

* * * * * * * * * *

Finally, there is a tendency for any innovation to regress towards the old, back to the way things were. Should that happen at UW-O, the consequences could be devastating. Already we have seen a diminution of the 7-week course offerings. Yet it was precisely this feature (along with the 3-week courses) that was to be attractive to the nontraditional student. UW-O's own forecasts demonstrate the sharp decline of 18-year-olds in the future. As discussed above, if they are not replaced by older students, the overall enrollment decline will begin again. So far, attracting new students--this highest priority goal--has received inadequate attention. Now that the innovation is functioning within the institution and the faculty have voted to continue it, it is absolutely essential that a crash effort be made in this area. Simply having a calendar will not bring in new students. In fact, it is more probable that in order to enroll these new clients faculty will have to leave the campus and offerings be taken to where non-traditional students are.

Goal accomplishment will also depend upon some other internal dynamics. Chief among these are the status and functioning of the faculty. While they now have positions on key institutional committees, as a collective they are about as ineffective as they were before the administrative change and the adoption of the innovation. While the Executive Committee of the Senate meets regularly with the chancellor, the Senate itself is not seen as an influential body by most faculty. Indeed, the Senate's leadership rarely includes those we judge to be the most able faculty, a clear sign that faculty strength remains weak.*

In addition to the absence of a faculty oligarchy, a leadership group often requisite for university-wide goal accomplishment; we noted several faculty commenting negatively on what constitutes an individual's successful academic career at UW-O. Of course good teachers could continue to teach and be rewarded by student appreciation. But it seemed to many faculty that the professors who rose to prominent positions found themselves pulled into administrative offices and away from faculty leadership roles. Perhaps the innovation and its support for faculty development along a number of dimensions--creative work, say--will produce the corps of faculty leadership UW-O needs.

---

* As a consequence, small faculty groups vie for power, especially as representatives of what they see as inevitable, namely, a faculty union.

Lastly, UW-O will not become known as a University of Alternatives simply by announcing this claim. There is going to have to be a massive courting of the town by the gown if support and participation are to take place. Top administrative personnel are going to have to direct their energy to this task if the innovation is to accomplish this important goal of a changed image. These activities cannot be delegated.

* * * * * * * * * *

Returning to where we entered the case, namely, as students of higher education, we not only have had the pleasure of witnessing a massive reformation in an entire, large institution but we also see exciting possibilities on the horizon. We hope that if not we, then at least others, will have the opportunity to observe and evaluate UW-O over the next half-dozen years. Its contribution to higher education in general--to say nothing of its already appreciable impact on its immediate environment--can be most important and needs to be reported.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. UW-O Cited Works and Documents

Cited Works:

Boque, Allan G. and Robert Taylor. *The University of Wisconsin.* Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1975.

Dunham, E. Alden, *Colleges of the Forgotten Americas: A Profile of State Colleges and Regional Universities.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.

Peterson, Harry M., "A Political Analysis of Organizational Change: A Case Study of The University of Wisconsin--Oshkosh," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Wisconsin, 1977.

UW-O Documents:

- *Advance-Titan* (Student Paper)
- Calendar Evaluation
  - Attitude Survey, 1975
  - Mid-Year Survey, 1975-1976
  - Mini Q Subjective Comments
- Catalogs, 1973-1977
- Chancellor's Office
  - Calendar Position Papers, No. 1-14
  - Memorandum re Referendum (2/10 and 2/18/77)
  - Progress Report to the Board of Regents, February, 1976
  - Report on the University of Alternatives, July, 1976
- Class Schedules, 1974-1977
- Committee Minutes
  - Budget Committee
  - Commission on Academic Affairs

  - Tenure and Flexibility Committee
  - University Calendar Coordinating Committee
- *Context* (all issues)
- Faculty Constitution and Bylaws
- Guide to Planning and Planning Documents, 1975-76, 1976-77
- Institutional Functioning Inventory
  - IFI 1976 Print-outs
  - IFI 1975 Print-outs
  - Self-Study, 1972
- Institutional Goals Inventory - Students, Faculty, and Administration, 1975-1976
- Institutional Research Office Print-outs
  - CDR Student Credit Hour, Spring, 1976
  - Faculty-Administration Calendar Evaluation, Spring, 1976
  - Requested Data Runs
  - Student Calendar Evaluation, Spring, 1976
- *Internal Evaluation of UW-O's New Calendar*, February, 1977 (Cox Report)
- Mahler Reports, *Faculty Development Program*, Nos. 2, 3, and 4 (1977)
- Memoranda
  - Director of Budget
  - Director, Office of Grants
- Organizational Charts, 1974-1977
- UW-O Reports
  - Assorted Miscellaneous Minutes, Reports, Documents
  - Enrollment
  - Student Master File
  - Supplemental Data File

II. Selected Related Research

Chadwick, Ronald Paul. "A Descriptive Study of the Historical Development of 4-1-4 Calendar Organization and Its Related Administrative and Curricular Instructional Innovation," unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Missouri, 1971.

Holmes, Rodger. "Influences of the 4-1-4 Plan on Curriculum and Administration," unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Indiana University, 1972.

Lightfield, Erwin Timothy. "An Interinstitutional Evaluation Among Selected Colleges of the 4-1-4 Calendar/Curriculum with Special Consideration Upon the Interim Term and Institutional Change," unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Florida State University, 1973.

Meeker, John C. "An Evaluation Study of Faculty Support Programs at Research Universities," unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1977.

Olson, Gilbert Thatcher. "Effects of Calendar Change and Year-Round Operation on the Utilization of Resources at Colleges and Universities," unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Arizona State University, 1971.

Walz, Orville Clyde. "A Study of Major Calendar Changes in Selected Institutions of Higher Education in the United States, 1969-1972," unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1972.

III. Selected General References Guiding our Evaluation

A. Evaluation Literature

Anderson, Scarvia B., Ball, Samuel, Murphy, Richard T., and Associates. *Encyclopedia of Educational Evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973 and 1975.

Bloom, Benjamin S. (ed.), *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Cognitive Domain*. New York: Logmans, Green, 1956.

Caro, Francis G. *Readings in Evaluation Research*. New York: Russel Sage, 1971.

Deniston, O. L., I. M. Rosenstock, and V. A. Getting, "Evaluation of Program Effectiveness," *Public Health Reports*, HEW, Vol. 83, No. 4, April, 1968, 323-335.

Deniston, O. L., I. M. Rosenstock, W. Welch, and V. A. Getting, "Evaluation of Program Efficiency," *Public Health Reports*, HEW, Vol. 83, No. 7, July, 1968, 603-609.

Dressel, Paul. *Handbook of Academic Evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Kratwohl, David R., Benjamin S. Bloom, and Bertram B. Masia, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Affective Domain*. New York: McKay, 1964.

Pace, C. Robert. *Thoughts on Evaluation in Higher Education*. Iowa City: ACT, 1971.

Popham, W. James (ed.), *Evaluation in Education*. California: McCutchan, 1974.

Ross, Lee and Lee J. Cronbach (eds.), "Review of the *Handbook of Evaluation Research*," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Education*, 1976, 81-107.

Struening, Elmer L. and Marcia Guttentag (eds.), *Handbook of Evaluation Research* (2 Volumes). Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1975.

Stufflebeam, Daniel L., Foley, Walter J., Gephart, William J., Guba, Egon G., Hammond, Robert L., Merriman, Howard O., Provus, Malcolm M. *Educational Evaluation and Decision Making*. Illinois: F. E. Peacock, 1971.

Tyler, Ralph W., *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950.

Tyler, Ralph W., and Robert M. Gagne, and Michael Scriven, *Perspectives of Curriculum Evaluation*. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1967.

Weiss, Carol H. *Evaluation Research Methods for Assessing Program Effectiveness*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Yavorsky, Diane K. "An Introduction to the Discrepancy Evaluation Model," University of Virginia, Evaluation Research Center, Occasional Paper No. 110, n.d.

B. Conceptual Literature

Baldridge, J. Victor and Terrence E. Deal (eds.), *Managing Change in Educational Organizations: Sociological Perspectives, Strategies and Case Studies*. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1975.

Cartwright, Dorwin and Alvin Zander, *Group Dynamics* (second edition). Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson, 1960.

Clark, Alfred W. (compiler), *Experimenting with Organizational Life: The Action Research Approach*. New York: Plenum Press, 1976.

Clark, Mary Jo. "Organizational Stress and Professional Performance Among Faculty Members at a Small College," unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1973.

Corwin, Ronald G. Reform and Organizational Survival. New York: Wiley, 1973.

Downs, George W., Jr. and Lawrence B. Mohr. "Conceptual Issues in the Study of Innovations," Administrative Science Quarterly, 21 (December, 1976): 700-714.

Gross, Neal, Joseph B., Giacquinta and Marilyn Bernstein. Implementing Organizational Innovations: A Sociological Analysis of Planned Educational Change. New York: Basic Books, 1971.

Katz, Daniel and Robert L. Kahn. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Mohr, Lawrence B., "Determinants of Innovations in Organizations," American Political Science Review, 63 (1969): 111-126.

Mohr, Lawrence B., "The Concept of Organizational Goal," American Political Science Review, 63 (June, 1973): 470-481.

Rodger, Everett M. with F. Floyd Shoemaker. Communication of Innovations. New York: The Free Press, 1971.

Rodgers, Everett M. and Rekha Agarwala-Rodgers. Communication in Organizations. New York: The Free Press, 1976.

Stern, Louis W., et. al., "The Effect of Sociometric Location on the Adoption of an Innovation Within a University Faculty," Sociology of Education, 4 (1976): 90-96.

Zaltman, Gerald, Robert Duncan, and Jonny Holbek. Innovations and Organizations. New York: Wiley, 1973.

Zaltman, Gerald, David H. Florio, Linda A. Sikorski. Dynamic Educational Change. New York: The Free Press, 1977.

APPENDICES

A: FIPSE PROPOSAL -- ABSTRACT

B: CONTRACT -- UW-O AND B & P HIGHER EDUCATION ASSOCIATES

C: QUESTIONNAIRES

1. Goal Matrix
2. Faculty
3. Students
4a. Staff (Directors)
4b. Staff (Others)
5. High School Counselors
6. Student Learning Data
7a. Oshkosh Citizens Survey
7b. High School Seniors Survey

APPENDIX A

FIPSE PROPOSAL -- ABSTRACT

ABSTRACT

Problem Background. Like many institutions of higher education, UWO has experienced a significant decline in the traditional 18 year-old enrollment state budget allocations, faculty positions and even public support since 1971. To counter these trends, the University proposed a new calendar plan in Summer, 1975 which would meet, in a distinctive way, the needs of present and projected university constituencies. The Calendar itself combines a traditional two semester system of 17 weeks each and an 8 week summer session, with an alternative calendar which divides the fall and spring semester each into three module of 7-7-3 weeks and a summer semester into two 4 week modules. The purposes of the two year Calendar experiment (1975-1977) are to encourage curricular innovation, foster faculty development, attract non-traditional learners, and increase student accessibility. The Calendar is the major structural component providing support for a new mission at UWO as a University of Alternatives.

Problem. Although the University has already made a significant effort to design and partially implement an evaluation system, there is a crucial need to employ extra-institutional experts in evaluation to fully explore the multi-faceted dimensions of the new Calendar. This is an extremely important task since the institution has made a significant departure from conventional higher education models and needs the most complete data obtainable to make decisions about which features should be retained, revised or eliminated. By supporting the concept of a comprehensive evaluation system by external evaluators, the University as well as other institutions will gain a great deal of insight into strengths, weaknesses, and potentials of the new Oshkosh Calendar.

General Objectives:

1. *To assess changes in campus activities, climate, and attitudes of students, faculty, administrators, and the Oshkosh community as a result of Calendar implementation.*

2. *To measure student and faculty attitudes toward unique instructional formats, teaching strategies, auto-technologies, and calendar time periods.*
3. *To evaluate student performance in courses with various instructional formats, teaching strategies and auto-technologies.*
4. *To evaluate the effectiveness of Calendar activities in meeting the needs of specific student interest groups, part-time adult learners, commuting students, "drop-in" - "drop-out" students, ethnic minorities, veterans, etc.*
5. *To assess the affective responses of faculty to the faculty development program which involves compensation for additional service for curriculum development, research opportunities, and in-service training.*

Description of Proposed Activities: A comprehensive evaluation requires that many aspects of the project be reviewed and assessed. An existing university team of evaluators will continue to administer and collect data by locally developed instruments, as well as process standardized instrument results. An extra-institutional team of experts in evaluation, headed by a national scholar, will develop additional instruments to measure the new Calendar's effectiveness, analyze and interpret all existing evaluation results as well as write research reports for scholarly journals and professional association meetings.

An Educational-Cultural Impact field study will be conducted by a cultural anthropologist or social psychologist to determine the impact of the Calendar on particular interest groups, the institution and the local community.

Nationally normed Institutional Goals Inventory and Institutional Functioning Inventory will be administered to determine changes in student, faculty, and administrator perceptions of institutional goals and operations. A locally constructed Attitude Survey will be administered to these same groups to ascertain the effects of Calendar reform upon specific institutional policies and practices. Additional "mini-questionnaires" will be developed to provide immediate feedback from affected students and faculty on Calendar related innovations so that program alterations may be made.

APPENDIX B

CONTRACT -- UW-O AND B & P HIGHER EDUCATION ASSOCIATES

CHARGE TO THE FIPSE CALENDAR EVALUATION TEAM

This agreement between the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh and the B & P Higher Education Associates establishes the broad charge to the FIPSE Calendar Evaluation Team. The Team will consist of a senior national scholar (Dr. Robert Blackburn, Professor, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Michigan) and two doctoral students (Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Michigan), one of whom will have a concentration area in institutional research and the other a concentration area in social psychology or cultural anthropology.

In fulfillment of this charge, the Evaluation Team will directly coordinate all evaluation activities with the FIPSE Grant Director (Dr. W. Sam Adams) and the Lily Foundation Grant Director (Dr. William Mahler). It is understood that all data derived from interviews and other sources of evaluation which involve individual responses will be confidential and the sole property of the FIPSE Evaluation Team. It is further understood that the final FIPSE Evaluation Team report will be submitted to the UWO FIPSE Grant Director by August 15, 1977, who in turn will forward this report, in its entirety and without revision, to the FIPSE Office, H.E.W. by August 31, 1977. At least one copy of the FIPSE Evaluation Team report will be retained in the UWO Polk Library Reserve Room for public review.

It will be the responsibility of the senior scholar to:

1. Design a comprehensive evaluation scheme for measuring the objective and subjective effects of the UWO Calendar on students, faculty, administrators, and the Oshkosh community.

2. Study several components of the Oshkosh Calendar to determine the relative cost of implementing these selected components.

3. Supervise and coordinate evaluation methods, instrument design, data interpretation, and research reports produced by two University of Michigan, Center for the Study of Higher Education, doctoral students.

4. Prepare the final report evaluating the UWO Calendar.

5. Prepare research articles for submission to scholarly journals.

It will be the responsibility of a doctoral student, with an emphasis in institutional research to:

1. Analyze existing data available from the Calendar Evaluation instruments.

2. Construct or modify existing objective instruments to assess calendar effectiveness.

3. Design computer programs to facilitate data analysis of these instruments (#2 above).

4. Draw a sample of class sections and a sample of students to assess effectiveness of new instructional techniques and delivery systems on student achievement.

5. Fulfill other requirements assigned by the senior scholar.

It will be the responsibility of a doctoral student, with an emphasis in social psychology or cultural anthropology, to:

1. Analyze existing calendar evaluation data on student, faculty, and administrator attitudes.

2. Construct subjective instruments and conduct interviews and field operations as needed to assess student, faculty, administrators, and community attitudes on calendar reform.

3. Collect and analyze data derived from these instruments and interviews (#2 above).

4. Fulfill other requirements assigned by the senior scholar.

APPENDIX C-1

GOAL MATRIX

October 11, 1976

TO: Representatives of UW-O Constituencies

FROM: Calendar Evaluation Project (Ellen Armstrong, Bob Blackburn, Marie Dykes)

SUBJECT: A Matrix on Institutional Goals

Attached is our first request of you. We will report the results of this survey as quickly as we can analyze your responses.

Instructions:
Down the left hand margin are twenty-four GOAL (AIMS/PURPOSES) statements related to the UW-O Calendar Plan. These statements have been taken from various documents and inferred from conversations with individuals on campus. They are not necessarily the original aims of the calendar revision, but each appears to be of high priority to at least one constituency of the university at this time.

Across the top are thirty-~~six~~ eight different, identifiable CONSTITUENCIES who have a relationship to each of the GOALS. In some instances, a constituency may consist of but a single individual (e.g., the chancellor) and in other cases a constituency may consist of such a large number that a homogeneity of views simply does not exist (e.g., graduate students). In the latter case, however, there can be thought to be a "typical" or "modal" view for that CONSTITUENCY and that is what we wish to have you use as the referent for that group.

Steps for Completion of Form:
1) Rank order from one (1) to one hundred (100) the twenty-four (24) goals in your constituency column. One (1) means the very highest priority; any number between one (1) and ten (10) would indicate high importance. One hundred (100) is the lowest priority; any number between ninety (90) and one hundred (100) would signify low importance. The moderate importance numbers are in the range of forty (40) to sixty (60).
2) Use only one number once!
3) An "X" has been placed randomly in other constituencies' columns we would like you to respond to. Please complete these columns in the same manner you did those of your own constituency. Even when you think two goals have about equal priority for a particular constituency, one goal must receive a higher number than the other. This entails, then, a ranking of goals and you are indicating your beliefs for each of the constituencies noted.

By way of illustration, we have entered what a Director of Admissions might have marked for himself. Note that he has thought most goals important (most all of his ratings are under 25) and only a few of moderate importance and only one of low value. Note that while he has used all of the numbers from 1 through 15, he correctly has not used any number twice. He would complete this instrument by filling in ratings for other constituencies as indicated ("X") on the basis of how he believes that individual will respond.

Finally, if you feel either a GOAL and/or a CONSTITUENCY of some importance has been left out, please write them in and assign them a rating in accordance with the directions just given.

Sign your name and constituency on the matrix and return to Calendar Evaluation Project, Testing Center, UW-O.

Thank you.

UW-O
CALENDAR GOALS
(AIMS/PURPOSES)
MATRIX

Last Name, First

(Constituency)

CONSTITUENCIES

GOALS	Chancellor	Vice Chancellor	Ass't Chan.- Admin. Programs	Ass't Chan.- Student Programs	Ass't Chan.- Univ. Relations	Ass't Vice Chan.- Acad. Development	Ass't Vice Chan.- Acad. Systems	Ass't Vice Chan.- Continuing Ed.	Ass't to the Vice Chancellor	Director - University Budget	Affirmative Action Officer	Director - Institutional Research	Director - Planning	Dean - Business Administration	Dean - Education	Dean - Letters and Science	Dean - Nursing	Dean - Graduate School	Dean - Library & Learning Resources		EXAMPLE-Director of Admissions
Give UW-O a distinct mission--a University of Alternatives																					3
Increase enrollment																					1
Attract "new" (non-traditional, older, part-time learners, etc.) students																					2
Achieve fiscal stability																					8
Improve campus morale																					28
Enhance staff flexibility																					50
Increase external resources																					5
Allow faculty development																					20
Prevent faculty lay-offs																					18
Increase faculty research output																					30
Stimulate interdisciplinary activity																					10
Increase faculty participation in governance																					55
Provide professional security																					9
Improve planning																					17
Serve as a model for other colleges and universities																					25
Provide more efficient use of facilities																					15
Improve student performance, (e.g., learning)																					13
Give program flexibility																					7
Increase curricular innovations																					6
Development of instructional techniques																					11
Re[illegible] time for a degree																					95
Improve the quality of education																					4
Improve the public image of UW-O																					12
Increase community involvement and interaction																					14

UW-O
CALENDAR GOALS
(AIMS/PURPOSES)
MATRIX

____
Last Name, First

____
(Constituency)

CONSTITUENCIES

GOALS	Business Admin. Faculty Member	Letters & Science Faculty Member	Education Faculty Member	Nursing Faculty Member	President Faculty Senate	President AAUP	President TAUWF	President WEAC	President OSA	Graduate Student	Editor Advance Titan	Black Student Assoc. Member	Chicano Student Assoc. Member	Native American Assoc. Member	President Oshkosh Common Council	Sr. Vice Pres. UW System-Academic	Chr. of Ed. Committee-Board of Regents	President Alumni Assoc.	Chairperson, Council of State University Chancellors		EXAMPLE-Director of Admissions
Give UW-O a distinct mission--a University of Alternatives																					3
Increase enrollment																					1
Attract "new (non-traditional, older, part-time learners, etc.) students																					2
Achieve fiscal stability																					8
Improve campus morale																					28
Enhance staff flexibility																					50
Increase external resources																					5
Allow faculty development																					20
Prevent faculty lay-offs																					18
Increase faculty research output																					30
Stimulate interdisciplinary activity																					10
Increase faculty participation in governance																					35
Provide professional security																					9
Improve planning																					17
Serve as a model for other colleges and universities																					25
Provide more efficient use of facilities																					15
Improve student performance, (e.g., learning)																					13
Give program flexibility																					7
Increase curricular innovations																					6
Development of instructional techniques																					11
Reduced time for a degree																					95
Improve the quality of education																					4
Improve the public image of UW-O																					12
Increase community involvement and interaction																					14

APPENDIX C-2

FACULTY

I.D.#__________
DATE__________

MICHIGAN EVALUATION PROJECT

FACULTY INTERVIEW

I am a member of the Michigan Evaluation Project Team conducting the outside evaluation of the new UWO academic calendar. In this interview we are interested in determining the impact that the restructured time options of the new calendar have had on you as a faculty member. Some of the questions are factual while others ask for your personal perceptions and opinions. Your responses will be kept anonymous and no individual names will ever be used in the reporting of our data. Identification numbers on the questionnaires are for coding and grouping responses. We hope that you will speak freely and frankly.

This interview will take approximately one hour. At the end of the interview I will leave you with a short questionnaire to return to me in a self-adressed envelope.

Do you have any questions?

---

1. Did you apply for Compensation for Additional Service (CAS) under the faculty development program? Yes_____ No_____

   a. If so, which programs?

   Research_____ Curr_____ Needs_____

   Faculty College_____ Travel_____

   Other, please specify

   b. What or who influenced your decision to apply (or not to apply)?
   _____Personal _____Professional _____Organization Factors (Dept, College, Admin)

   c. What problems did you encounter?

   d. What benefits resulted?

I.D.#__________

2. Did you offer a 7 or 3 week course? Yes _____ No _____

   a. What or who influenced your decision to offer (or not to offer)?

      ________Personal
      ________Professional
      ________Students
      ________Organization factors (e.g. SCH, Dept, Admin, etc.)
      ________Course content

   b. What problems did you encounter?

   c. What benefits resulted?

3. Was your academic schedule altered in any way under the options of the revised calendar?

   a. If so, in what way?

   b. Did you initiate the schedule?

   c. How was the arrangement satisfactory to you? Unsatisfactory?

I.D.#_________

4. What is the greatest difference the calendar revision options have made in terms of the university?

   a. Your department (unit or divison, as appropriate)?

   b. Your college?

   c. The university?

_____Flexibility _____Time _____Workload _____Stimulated Faculty

_____Additional Salary Support _____Competition

5. What do you think was the major factor influencing the faculty vote for calendar revision in 1974?

_____Enrollment threats _____Layoffs, security

_____Chancellor _____Educational Value

I.D.#__________

6. What role did the faculty play in the decision making about the restructured time options of the new calendar?

What role did you play?

7. Were there any unanticipated consequences or side effects due to the restructured time options?

a. What were they?

b. How did they affect you?

c. What was done about them?

I.D.#__________

8. What are the incentives for participating in the new options under the revised calendar?

_____SCH for dept

_____Protect positions

_____Time flexibility

_____Salary

_____Support for active faculty

_____Recruitment

_____Seed money for external grants

_____Personal growth

_____↑ Professional competence

---

9. What impact do you think the restructured time options has had on the students? What evidence do you have?

_____Learn less

_____↓ Quality

_____Poorer students

_____Free 3 weeks

_____Schedule Flexibility

I.D.#__________

10. What types of factors influence faculty rewards (such as merit increases, tenure, promotion, etc) at Oshkosh?

_____Research, scholarship

_____Service to dept

_____Teaching

_____National Reputation

_____Discipline

_____Committee work

_____Conformity

_____Ability to ↑ SCH

_____Students

11. What kind of influence do you feel you have in your department (unit or program)?

a. In your college?

b. In the university?

I.D.#__________

12. What is the major satisfaction in work at Oshkosh?

What is the major dissatisfaction in work at Oshkosh?

Satisfactions

_____Teaching
_____Research
_____Service
_____Academic Freedom
_____Students
_____Colleagues
_____Geography
_____Workload
_____Salary

Dissatisfactions

_____No support for research
_____Powerlessness
_____Paperwork
_____Students
_____Teaching emphasis
_____Research emphasis
_____Reputation
_____Atmosphere
_____Uncertainty
_____Inadequate tenure/promotion criteria
_____Salary
_____Resources

---

13. What do you see as the distinctive role that UWO plays in higher education?

I.D.#__________

14. What kinds of pressure do faculty feel most around Oskosh?

_____Uncertainty, insecurity
_____Time
_____Pressure to innovate
_____Job security
_____Enrollment
_____Workload
_____Conflict and competition
_____Social pressure
_____Publish
_____Meeting criteria for merit, tenure, promotion, etc.
_____Lack of faculty power
_____Administration, Leadership unclarity
_____Quality
_____Lack of autonomy
_____Retirement security

---

15. What do you perceive to be the greatest threat to the university in the near future?
To your department (Unit, program, or college)?
To you?

_____Tenure
_____Accountability demands
_____Money
_____Unionization
_____Elimination of programs
_____Changing criteria for excellence
_____Declining enrollments
_____Increased number of administrators

I.D.#__________

16. What is the general feeling of faculty regarding the leadership style of the Chancellor and his staff?

17. In summary, what do you see as the two greatest strengths and two greatest weaknesses of the restructured time options of the new calendar?

I.D. #__________

MICHIGAN EVALUATION PROJECT

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Following are a number of statements about various aspects of the restructured time options under the new calendar. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of these statements by placing a check in the appropriate column:

	Strongly Agree	Agree with Somewhat	Disagree with Somewhat	Strongl Disagr
1. The idea of a "Faculty College" where the faculty take courses to update their professional competency, learn about new instructional technology and broaden their general education experiences is sound.	____	____	____	____
2. The availability of the CAS funds will allow faculty to grow in professional vitality.	____	____	____	____
3. The modular calendar is encouraging the planning and development of innovative programs.	____	____	____	____
4. The idea of an "off-campus" program where faculty receive CAS funds for tuition and travel to support professional development activities is a sound one.	____	____	____	____
5. There will be an increased effectiveness of instruction as a result of recent faculty development activities and programs brought into being through calendar reform.	____	____	____	____
6. There is a greater variety of educational approaches which emphasize individual needs and learning styles being developed now at UW-O.	____	____	____	____
7. The new calendar increases the efficiency with which faculty organize their professional time.	____	____	____	____

I.D.#__________

B. Please indicate which of the following activities you have participated in since Fall 1975 (mark all that apply).

____ 8. Offered a 7-week course.
____ 9. Offered a 3-week course.
____ 10. Offered a 14-week course.
____ 11. Used PSI or auto-tutorial.
____ 12. Organized or led a Faculty College session.
____ 13. Attended a Faculty College session.
____ 14. Applied for a curriculum development award.
____ 15. Applied for a research award.
____ 16. Received CAS under the Faculty Development Program.
____ 17. Applied for extramural funding.
____ 18. Participated in an interdisciplinary course.
____ 19. Taught an inlead summer session.

C. Listed below are a number of examples of things that some professors consider pressures of their jobs. Please go over this list and rate each item on the degree to which it is a source of pressure in your work.

ONE CHECK FOR EACH STATEMENT	Sources of Pressure in My Work			
	Great source	Somewhat a source	Hardly a source	Not a source
20. Overwhelming work load. Too many things need to be done.	____	____	____	____
21. The desire to succeed.	____	____	____	____
22. Not measuring up to the demands of the job, lack of training or knowledge, or talent.	____	____	____	____
23. Responsibility for and control of people's futures.	____	____	____	____
24. Competition to keep up with my colleagues.	____	____	____	____
25. Not enough time to think and contemplate.	____	____	____	____
26. The feeling of never having any time.	____	____	____	____
27. The "publish or perish" race.	____	____	____	____
28. Not being able to allocate my time and resources as I wish to.	____	____	____	____
29. The job interferes with family life.	____	____	____	____

I.D. #__________

D. On the next page is a list of some university support services. For each area, please indicate your assessment of these services by circling the appropriate response to each of the following questions:

Column A: How frequent is your contact with each area?

Column B: What is the quality of your experience with it? (That is, how satisfied are you with the service it offers?)

Column C: Has your satisfaction with the area changed since the restructuring?

NOTE: For areas you mark "L" in Column A, do not mark a response in Columns B and C.

I.D. #__________

		A	B	C
		How frequent is your contact with this area?	How would you rate the quality of your experience with it?	Has your satisfaction with it changed since restructuring?
		VF = Very frequent AL = A lot S = Some SL = Slight L = Little or none	VS = Very Satisfied S = Somewhat satisfied N = Neutral SD = Somewhat dissatisfied VD = Very dissatisfied	MS = More satisfied NC = About the same OR No change LS = Less satisfied
a.	Admissions -- Division of New Students	VF AL S SL L	VS S N SD VD	MS NC LS
b.	Registration Office	VF AL S SL L	VS S N SD VD	MS NC LS
c.	Financial Aid Office	VF AL S SL L	VS S N SD VD	MS NC LS
d.	Central Advising Office	VF AL S SL L	VS S N SD VD	MS NC LS
e.	Veterans Office	VF AL S SL L	VS S N SD VD	MS NC LS
f.	Library	VF AL S SL L	VS S N SD VD	MS NC LS
g.	Media Services	VF AL S SL L	VS S N SD VD	MS NC LS
h.	Computer Services	VF AL S SL L	VS S N SD VD	MS NC LS
i.	Health Services &Counseling	VF AL S SL L	VS S N SD VD	MS NC LS
j.	Reading & Development Center	VF AL S SL L	VS S N SD VD	MS NC LS
k.	Testing & Evaluation Service	VF AL S SL L	VS S N SD VD	MS NC LS
l.	Faculty Research Board	VF AL S SL L	VS S N SD VD	MS NC LS
m.	Placement &Career Planning	VF AL S SL L	VS S N SD VD	MS NC LS
n.	Bookstore	VF AL S SL L	VS S N SD VD	MS NC LS

I.D.# ____________

E. BACKGROUND AND GENERAL INFORMATION

Please circle the number of the most suitable option.

30. What is your present rank?

1. Instructor
2. Assistant Professor
3. Associate Professor
4. Professor
5. Other, please specify ______________________

31. What kind of appointment do you have?

1. Full-time with tenure
2. Full-time without tenure
3. Part-time with tenure
4. Part-time without tenure
5. Other, please specify ______________________

32. What is your marital status?

1. Single
2. Married
3. Other

33. What is your sex?

1. Male
2. Female

34. What is your present age?

1. Under 25
2. 25-29
3. 30-34
4. 35-39
5. 40-44
6. 45-49
7. 50-54
8. 55-59
9. 60 or over

35. How long have you held an academic appointment at this institution (including this year)?

1. 1 year or less
2. 2-3 years
3. 4-6 years
4. 7-9 years
5. 10-14 years
6. 15-19 years
7. 20-29 years
8. 30 years or more

36. At how many different colleges or universities have you held a full-time academic appointment (beyond the level of teaching or research assistant)?

1. None
2. One
3. Two
4. Three
5. Four
6. Five
7. Six
8. Seven or more

37. What is the highest degree you hold?

1. Undergraduate, Bachelor or less
2. Masters
3. Ph.D.
4. Ed.D.
5. Other, please specify __________

I.D.#__________

38. To how many academic or professional journals do you subscribe?

1. None
2. 1-2
3. 3-4
4. 5-10
5. 11-20
6. More than 20

39. Have you attended any national meetings of professional associations within the past three years?

1. Yes
2. No

40. On how many faculty committees--department (unit or division), college, or university--are you now a member?

1. None
2. One
3. Two
4. Three
5. Four or more

41. Do your interests lie primarily in teaching or research?

1. Very heavily in research
2. Both, but leaning to research
3. Both, leaning to teaching
4. Very heavily in teaching

42. How many articles, books, or monographs have you published in the last three years?

1. None
2. 1-2
3. 3-4
4. 5-10
5. 11-20
6. More than 20

43. In the current term what percentage of your time is actually devoted to the following activities.

____% Teaching undergraduates
____% Teaching graduate students
____% Research
____% Curriculum development
____% Administration (committee work, etc.)
____% Other, please specify ______________________

(Should equal 100% total, if full-time)

44. In the past 5 years, did you receive support from (mark all sources that apply)

____ Institutional or departmental funds
____ Federal agencies
____ State or local government agencies
____ Private foundations
____ Other
____ None

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND ATTENTION.

Please return to: Michigan Evaluation Project
Marie Draper Dykes
Testing Center
743 Algoma

An addressed envelope is provided for your convenience.

APPENDIX C-3

STUDENTS

TO: UW-O Students

FROM: Ellen Armstrong, Michigan Evaluation Team

SUBJECT: Calendar Evaluation

DATE: November, 1976

As you may know, two colleagues and I from the University of Michigan have undertaken to evaluate the changes that have taken place at UW-O over the past year and a half. The largest of these changes was, of course, the calendar reform, but this one was really only a part of a more general restruturing of time at UW-O, in an attempt to give everyone here more options in the way they spend their time at the university.

You the Oshkosh student are a direct beneficiary of many of the restructured time options, particularly when it comes to determining at what pace you will follow your program here and how soon you will finish. The first part of this questionnaire attempts to determine exactly how the new options affect you and what you think of them. We are interested, for example, in whether you are taking advantage of the more flexible policy for dropping courses or taking an incomplete in a course.

The second part of the questionnaire concerns the university's support systems, or those areas that do not relate directly to the transmission of knowledge, but facilitate this and try to make life easier for you while you are here. We would ultimately like to determine whether the restructured time options have helped or hindered these support areas as they attempt to serve you.

Your opinion is very important to us. Your opinions and comments will help faculty and staff correct shortcomings in the present operation of the university and give them ideas for creating new means for improving your education at UW-O. We will appreciate your quick and complete return of this questionnaire, along with any comments you care to make, in the enclosed enveloped to our office in the Testing Center (743 Algoma). You were selected at random to participate in this evaluation, and the code number on the questionnaire merely allows us to determine whether or not your questionnaire has been returned. Your answers will be kept completely confidential, and we hope that you will answer these questions freely and frankly.

If you have any questions concerning this or any other aspect of our evaluation, please feel free to contact us through Lynn Borlen at the Testing Center (4-3227). Thank you for your help and cooperation.

I.D.#____________

MICHIGAN EVALUATION PROJECT
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - OSHKOSH
STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Have you ever enrolled in courses in any of these time blocks?

Continuous Registration	No___	Yes, one course___	Yes, more than one___
7-week	No___	Yes, one course___	Yes, more than one___
3-week	No___	Yes, one course___	Yes, more than one___
4-week summer	No___	Yes, one course___	Yes, more than one___

2. For each time block in which you have completed at least one course, rate the courses according to the following scale. If you have taken more than one course in a particular block, consider the course closest to your career interest. If you have taken courses in two or more time blocks of the same length, respond to the most recent course.

4 = very satisfied
3 = somewhat satisfied
2 = somewhat dissatisfied
1 = very dissatisfied

	7-week				3-week				4-week summer			
pacing of the course	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
amount of material covered	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
workload, assignments	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
my academic achievement	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

3. Which time block do you prefer? Place a "1" in the space by your first choice and a "2" in the space by your second choice.

14-week____ 7-week____ 3-week____ 4-week summer____

8-week summer____ Continuous registration____

I.D.#____________

4. On the next two pages is a set of instructional activities which you may have experienced in high school or previous college course work (at UW-O or elsewhere). For each item, circle the appropriate response to the following questions:

Column A: Have you participated in this experienced prior to UW-O?*
Column B: Did you expect UW-O to offer this?
Column C: Have you experienced this since coming to UW-O?
Column D: Was it a valuable learning experience at UW-O?
Column E: How important is it to you to have this experience sometime during your college career?

*NOTE: For those that you mark Y(yes), also circle HS if you had the experience in high school, and/or CU if you had the experience in another college or university.

	A		B		C		D		E		
	Have you participated in this prior to UW-O? in HS? in CU?		Did you expect UW-O to offer this?		Have you experienced this since coming to UW-O?		Was it a valuable learning experience at UW-O?		How important is it to you to have this experience sometime during your college career?		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Very	Somewhat	Not at all
a. Small class in which less than 10 students were enrolled	Y HS CU	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	V	S	N
b. Large class in which more than 50 students were enrolled	Y HS CU	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	V	S	N
c. One-to-one contact with a teacher as part of a course	Y HS CU	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	V	S	N
d. Group project as part of a course	Y HS CU	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	V	S	N
e. Student-led discussion as part of a course	Y HS CU	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	V	S	N
f. Student-designed course	Y HS CU	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	V	S	N
g. Individual study project independent of a regular class	Y HS CU	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	V	S	N

I.D.#____________

	A		B		C		D		E		
	Have you participated in this prior to UW-O? in HS? in CU?		Did you expect UW-O to offer this?		Have you experienced this since coming to UW-O?		Was it a valuable learning experience at UW-O?		How important is it to you to have this experience sometime during your college career?		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Very	Somewhat	Not at all
h. Experiences in your local community as part of a course	Y HS CU	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	V	S	N
i. Single course involving instructors or subject materials from more than one department or class	Y HS CU	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	V	S	N
j. Experience with a computer as part of a course	Y HS CU	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	V	S	N
k. Experience with video-tape or TV as part of a course	Y HS CU	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	V	S	N
l. Experience with audio tape-recording (e.g., language laboratory) as part of a course	Y HS CU	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	V	S	N
m. Laboratory work as part of a science course	Y HS CU	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	V	S	N
n. Self-paced learning activities	Y HS CU	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	S	N
Course in which mastery of a unit was required before you could move on to the next unit	Y HS CU	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	V	S	N

I.D.# __________

	A Have you participated in this ~~prior~~ prior to UW-O? in HS? in CU?		B Did you expect UW-O to offer this?		C Have you experienced this since coming to UW-O?		D Was it a valuable learning experience at UW-O?		E How important is it to you to have this experience sometime during your college career?		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Very	Somewhat	Not at all
p. Course in which you were graded on a pass-fail basis	Y HS CU	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	V	S	N
q. Course which took less than a full (14-week) semester to complete	Y HS CU	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	V	S	N
r. Course for which you could register anytime during a semester	Y HS CU	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	V	S	N

5. INSTRUCTIONS: On this page and the next is a list of some support services of the university, that is, offices and people who are here to aid in your learning. For each area, please circle the appropriate response to the following questions. (NOTE: For any service to which you respond "N" (No contact) under Column A, omit Columns B & C and go on to the next item.)

Column A: Have you ever had contact with this support area?
Column B: How frequent is your contact with the area during a semester?
Column C: How satisfied are you with the service offered by the area?

	A Have you ever had contact with this support area? P = Prior to first-enrolling at UW-O only B = Before and since enrolling S = Since enrolling only N = No contact	B How frequent is your contact with the area? F = Frequent S = Some L = Little or none	C How satisfied are you with the service it offers? V = Very satisfied S = Somewhat satisfied SD = Somewhat dissatisfied D = Very dissatisfied
a. New Students Division (Admissions)	P B S N	F S L	V S SD D

I.D.#____________

	A Have you ever had contact with this support area? P = Prior to first enrolling at UW-O only B = Before and since enrolling S = Since enrolling only N = No contact				B How frequent is your contact with the area? F = Frequent S = Some L = Little or none			C How satisfied are you with the service it offers? V = Very satisfied S = Somewhat satisfied SD = Somewhat dissatisfied D = Very dissatisfied			
b. Registration Office	P	B	S	N	F	S	L	V	S	SD	D
c. Financial Aid Office	P	B	S	N	F	S	L	V	S	SD	D
d. Housing Office	P	B	S	N	F	S	L	V	S	SD	D
e. Central Advising Office	P	B	S	N	F	S	L	V	S	SD	D
f. Veterans Office	P	B	S	N	F	S	L	V	S	SD	D
g. Library	P	B	S	N	F	S	L	V	S	SD	D
h. Media Services (AV)	P	B	S	N	F	S	L	V	S	SD	D
i. Computer Center	P	B	S	N	F	S	L	V	S	SD	D
j. Health Center	P	B	S	N	F	S	L	V	S	SD	D
k. Counseling Center	P	B	S	N	F	S	L	V	S	SD	D
l. Reading/Study Center	P	B	S	N	F	S	L	V	S	SD	D
m. Testing Center	P	B	S	N	F	S	L	V	S	SD	D
n. Placement Center	P	B	S	N	F	S	L	V	S	SD	D
o. Union Bookstore	P	B	S	N	F	S	L	V	S	SD	D

6. If you are working to help support yourself while you are a student, have the restructured time options (for example, 7-week courses) helped____ or hindered____ you in finding part-time employment?

7. How has your course load (number of credits carried) for a full 17-week semester been affected by the calendar reform? (Mark "Not applicable if you first enrolled at UW-O after June 1975.)

It has: increased____ decreased____ stayed the same____ not applicable____

I.D.#__________

8. IF YOU FIRST ENTERED UW-O AFTER THE CALENDAR REFORM WAS IMPLEMENTED (June, 1975), were you aware of the changes when you applied to UW-O?

Yes____ No____

9. Do you presently have Incompletes in any of the following types of courses? If so, please indicate how many Incompletes you have.

Continuous registration Yes____ No____ # of Incompletes_____
3-week courses Yes____ No____ # of Incompletes_____
7-week courses Yes____ No____ # of Incompletes_____
14-week courses Yes____ No____ # of Incompletes_____
4-week summer courses Yes____ No____ # of Incompletes_____
8-week summer courses Yes____ No____ # of Incompletes_____

10. Are you more or less likely to take an Incomplete now than before the calendar reform? (mark "Not Applicable" if you first enrolled after June, 1975.)

More likely____ No difference____ Less likely____ Not Applicable____

11. How many times did you drop a course or courses from your schedule this semester?

0____ 1____ 2____ 3____ 4____ 5____ More than 5____

12. Did you subsequently add other courses to your schedule? If so, how many?

Yes____ No____ 1____ 2____ 3____ 4____ 5____ More than 5____

13. For the last course you dropped, approximately how far along in the course were you when you dropped it?

1/4 through_____ 1/2 through_____ 3/4 through_____

14. Are you more or less likely to change your schedule by dropping courses now than before the calendar reform? (Mark "Not Applicable" if you first enrolled after June, 1975.)

More likely____ No difference____ Less likely____ Not Applicable____

15. Your year at UW-O: Freshman____ Sophomore____ Junior____ Senior____
Graduate____ Special____

16. College you are enrolled in: Business____ Education____ L & S____
Nursing____ Undecided____

17. Major field (or anticipated major field)__________________________

18. Age: 17____ 18____ 19____ 20____ 21____ 22____ 23-25____ 26-30____ Over 30____

I.D.#________

19. Race: Caucasian____ Black____ Native American____ Oriental____
Spanish-American____ Other____

20. Home state: Wisconsin____ Other____
Home county, if you are a Wisconsin resident____

21. When you first enrolled at UW-O (month and year):____________

22. Have you ever attended another college or university? Yes___ No___
If so, name the institution(s)______________________________

23. How many credits are you registered for this semester?____________

24. How many hours per week are you employed?__________________

25. What is your approximate cumulative GPA?______________

Thank you for your time and cooperation. Please return this questionnaire to:

Ellen Armstrong
Michigan Evaluation Project
Testing Center
743 Algoma Boulevard

APPENDIX C-4a

STAFF (DIRECTORS)

I.D.#____________

Date______________

MICHIGAN EVALUATION PROJECT

SUPPORT SERVICES INTERVIEW

I am a member of the Michigan Evaluation Project Team conducting the outside evaluation of the new UW-O academic calendar. In this interview we are interested in determining what impact the restructured time options of the new calendar have had in your area of support services. Some of these questions may ask you for a personal opinion or perception, while others will ask you to respond in your institutional role. As much as possible your responses will be kept anonymous, and your name will never be used in the reporting of our data, but the discussion of the calendar's impact on support services will of necessity involve some mention of specific offices or roles. Nevertheless, we hope that you will speak as freely and frankly as possible. The interview will take approximately one hour. Is that your expectation? Do you have any questions?

1. What was your personal involvement in the planning of the calendar reform, which led to the restructured time options?

   voting member of a committee____ ex officio member of a committee____

   advisor to the Chancellor___ none (handed a fait accompli)___

   (if none, probe for any input at all)

2a. How was your office involved in the planning?

   members of staff on committees___ office provided data to committees___

   not applicable — office new since restructuring____

b. (If the office is new following restructuring) How did your office come to be created? Where were its functions performed before?

I.D.#__________

3. Did you suggest any areas that needed to be considered (for example, problems that might arise, policies that needed to be changed, etc.)? If so, what?

4. Which policies that were revised or created by the University Calendar Coordinating Committee (UCCC) directly affect the functioning of your office?

(If respondent was a member of the committee considering these policies, go to question 5; if not, go to question 8.)

5. How did ____________________ (each particular policy) happen to come up (whose idea, whose question)?

I.D.#______________

6. (For each policy) Were you personally satisfied with the way the issue was resolved? Yes____ No____

7. (For each policy) Do you think the new policy is effective? Is it doing what it was supposed to do? Yes_________ No____________

8. Did you feel your office would be directly changed by the restructuring? If so, how?

9. What adjustments have been made in your office from last year to this year to make the system work better? (Not necessarily policy changes, but bugs being ironed out.)

I.D.#________

10. Were there some general consequences of the restructuring that turned out differently than people had anticipated? If so, what?

11. Have there been any unexpected benefits to you personally, your office, or your clientele as a result of the changes?

Any unexpected problems, or problems that haven't been solved yet?

I.D.#__________

12. Using this scale (show satisfaction scale card), how would you judge the effectiveness of your office before the restructuring?

1 2 3 4

Were there practices or policies that needed change anyway? Were there any that were in the process of being changed?

13. Have there been any other changes in the way your office functions in the last two years that you feel have not resulted from the restructuring? If so, what?

14. Using the same satisfaction scale, how would you judge the effectiveness of your office now?

1 2 3 4

I.D.#__________

15. Can you identify one or two other administrative or support offices with which you work more closely than with others?

How has your relationship with these offices been affected by the restructuring?

16. Can you think of further modifications which could be made in the restructured time options that would enable your office to do its job better? If so, what?

17. Can you identify problem areas for which new policies have still to be developed as a result of the restructuring? If so, what?

I.D.#____________

18. You have identified
as your top-rated goal for Oshkosh. How do you see your office as helping to achieve this goal?

(If respondent did not fill out a matrix, show one.) You may have seen this matrix of goals which various people feel to be related to the calendar reform. Would you mind taking a moment to look through these and identifying the one you feel is most important for UW-O to achieve?

How do you see your office as helping to achieve this goal?

I.D.#__________

19. In summary, what do you see as the two greatest strengths of the restructured time options as they relate to the functions of your office? How about the two greatest weaknesses?

20. Finally, I'd like you to look at this list of various dimensions of your office and rate each of them on how they have changed as a result of restructuring, using the scale at the top of the page.

Respondent__________

Office__________

I.D.#__________

5 much more or greater than before the calendar reform
4 somewhat more or greater than before
3 about the same
2 somewhat less than before
1 much less than before

Administrative personnel required in your office	5	4	3	2	1
Clerical or support personnel required in your office	5	4	3	2	1
Equipment or supplies required in your office	5	4	3	2	1
Faculty contact with your office	5	4	3	2	1
Administrative contact with your office	5	4	3	2	1
Student contact with your office	5	4	3	2	1
Your time spent solving immediate problems	5	4	3	2	1
Your time spent planning ahead or anticipating problems	5	4	3	2	1
Other (please specify)__________ ______________________________	5	4	3	2	1

Please check the area which has changed the most.

UW-O CALENDAR GOALS (AIMS/PURPOSES)

1. Give UW-O distinct mission — a University of Alternatives
2. Increase enrollment
3. Attract "new" (non-traditional, older, part-time learners, etc.) students
4. Achieve fiscal stability
5. Improve campus morale
6. Enhance staff flexibility
7. Increase external resources
8. Allow faculty development
9. Prevent faculty lay-offs
10. Increase faculty research output
11. Stimulate interdisciplinary activity
12. Increase faculty participation in governance
13. Provide professional security
14. Improve planning
15. Serve as a model for other colleges and universities
16. Provide more efficient use of facilities
17. Improve student performance (e.g., learning)
18. Give program flexibility
19. Increase curricular innovations
20. Development of instructional techniques
21. Reduced time for a degree
22. Improve the quality of education
23. Improve the public image of UW-O
24. Increase community involvement and interaction

APPENDIX C-4b

STAFF (OTHERS)

I.D.#____________

Date____________

MICHIGAN EVALUATION PROJECT

SUPPORT SERVICES STAFF INTERVIEW

I am a member of the Michigan Evaluation Project Team conducting the outside evaluation of the new UW-O academic calendar. In this interview we are interested in determining what impact the restructured time options of the new calendar have had in your area of support services. Some of these questions will ask you for a personal opinion or perception, while others will ask you to respond in your institutional role. As much as possible your responses will be kept anonymous, and your name will never be used in the reporting of our data, but the discussion of the calendar's impact on support services will of necessity involve some mention of specific offices or roles. Nevertheless, we hope you will speak as freely and frankly as possible. The interview will take approximately half an hour. Is that your expectation? Do you have any questions?

1. How long have you been in your present position?

   Less than one year_____ One year_____ Two years_____ More than two years_____

2. What position did you hold prior to this one?

3. How, where, and by whom was your job performed previously? (Omit this question if job and incumbent have not changed in at least three years.)

I.D.#________

4. I'd like to ask a few questions relating to the impact of the restructured time options on your job. First of all, are you doing things differently now than you did before; that is, has the process of your job changed?

5. Are you doing different things; that is, has the content of your job changed?

6. Have there been any changes in what you do or the way you do it that you do not attribute to the restructuring?

7. Were there things that turned out differently than you had anticipated?

I.D.#__________

8. Have the effects of the restructured time options caused any problems for you and the way you do your job?

Have they brought you any unexpected benefits?

9. Do you have any suggestions for changing or improving any policies or procedures in your office to make it more effective?

10. Do you have any suggestions for modifying the restructured time options in general? If so, what?

10a. Using this scale, how satisfied are you with the job you are doing in this support area? (Show card)

1 2 3 4

I.D.#__________

11. In summary, what do you see as the two greatest strengths of the restructured time options as they related to the functions of your office? How about the two greatest weaknesses?

12. Finally, I'd like you to look at this list of various dimensions of your job and rate each of them on how they have changed as a direct result of restructuring, using the scale at the top of the page.

Respondent____________

Office______________

I.D.#__________

5 much more or greater than before the calendar reform
4 somewhat more or greater than before
3 about the same
2 somewhat less than before
1 much less than before

Contact with faculty	5	4	3	2	1
Contact with students	5	4	3	2	1
Contact with individual administrators	5	4	3	2	1
Contact with other administrative offices	5	4	3	2	1
Your own area of responsibility	5	4	3	2	1

APPENDIX C-5

HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELORS

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION
School of Education
Corner East and South University Avenues
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109

Tel. (313) 764-9472

February 23, 1977

The University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh has received a federal grant to study the impact a new academic calendar has on the institution and the people it serves. As the principal external investigator on this project, I am concerned how people outside the university judge what is going on inside. As a person who aids potential students and who hears of the experiences of current and former students at UW-O, you are a valuable source of reliable and valid information.

That is why I write and ask you to take ten minutes to complete the enclosed brief questionnaire. The questionnaire solicits your opinions on how the changes at UW-O have affected the students you counsel. A self-addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience. The identification number is for follow-up purposes only. You are assured complete anonymity. (Our project has been cleared by the Human Subjects Review Committees of HEW and the University of Michigan.) Your name will never be used nor will it be possible for you to be identified by UW-O or anyone else. We want you to be candid. Our report will be delivered in August, 1977, and available to everyone.

Thank you very much for your assistance.

Cordially,

Robert T. Blackburn
Professor of Higher Education

RTB/ek

P.S. Please feel free to comment on all parts of the questionnaire.

Code No.

Counselor Questionnaire: UW-O Project

1. In a sentence or two, what are the principal reasons why some graduates of your school choose to attend UW-O.

____

____

____

2. In a sentence or two, what are the principal reasons why some graduates of your school purposely do not go to UW-O.

____

____

____

3. From what you have heard about the changes that have taken place at UW-O the past couple of years, how would you rate their overall impact on your high school students' perception of UW-O? (Circle the letter of the statement which best applies.)

   a. UW-O is viewed appreciably more favorably now than it was before the changes.

   b. UW-O is viewed somewhat more favorably now than it was before the changes.

   c. UW-O is viewed about the same now as it was before the changes.

   d. UW-O is viewed somewhat less favorably now than it was before the changes.

   e. UW-O is viewed appreciably less favorably now than it was before the changes.

4. What effect does UW-O's open admissions policy have on the college choice of higher achieving students? (Circle the letter of the statement which best applies.)

   a. Makes UW-O more attractive.

   b. Makes no difference.

   c. Makes UW-O less attractive.

Code No. ________

Instructions:

Below is a list of characteristics of education at UW-0. Immediately alongside each is a place for you to circle "Y" (yes) or "N" if you know or have heard about the characteristic. Circle the appropriate letter for each. Then, for each circled "Y", circle in the next column the letter which expresses your judgment of its worth. In the last column, circle the letter which describes how it affects student decisions to attend UW-0.

Characteristics	Heard or Know of it		Worth					Extent to which it affects a student's decision to attend UW-0				
	Yes	No	Excellent	Good	Fair	Unimportant	Don't know or can't judge	Great deal	Some	Not much	Not at all	Acts negative
1. Complete bachelor's degree in less than 4 years	Y	N	E	G	F	U	DK	G	S	N	NA	Neg
2. Self-paced instruction opportunities	Y	N	E	G	F	U	DK	G	S	N	NA	Neg
3. Variety in scheduling classes	Y	N	E	G	F	U	DK	G	S	N	NA	Neg
4. Special program availability (e.g., nursing, business, art, . . .)	Y	N	E	G	F	U	DK	G	S	N	NA	Neg
5. Provisions for continuous registration	Y	N	E	G	F	U	DK	G	S	N	NA	Neg
6. Excellent academic reputation	Y	N	E	G	F	U	DK	G	S	N	NA	Neg
7. Short terms (e.g., 7 weeks) allow more flexibility	Y	N	E	G	F	U	DK	G	S	N	NA	Neg
8. Media Center	Y	N	E	G	F	U	DK	G	S	N	NA	Neg
9. January and May interterms allow for free credits	Y	N	E	G	F	U	DK	G	S	N	NA	Neg
10. Extracurricular activities	Y	N	E	G	F	U	DK	G	S	N	NA	Neg
11. Closeness to students' homes	Y	N	E	G	F	U	DK	G	S	N	NA	Neg

CONTINUED ON OTHER SIDE

Characteristics	Heard or Know of it		Worth					Extent to which it affects a student's decision to attend UW-O				
	Yes	No	Excellent	Good	Fair	Unimportant	Don't know or can't judge	Great deal	Some	Not much	Not at all	Acts negative
12. Ease of dropping and adding courses	Y	N	E	G	F	U	DK	G	S	N	NA	Neg
13. Administrative leadership	Y	N	E	G	F	U	DK	G	S	N	NA	Neg
14. Schedule allows for more work opportunities	Y	N	E	G	F	U	DK	G	S	N	NA	Neg
15. Dual college and high school credit opportunities	Y	N	E	G	F	U	DK	G	S	N	NA	Neg
16. Faculty development program opportunities	Y	N	E	G	F	U	DK	G	S	N	NA	Neg
17. Athletic facilities adequacy	Y	N	E	G	F	U	DK	G	S	N	NA	Neg
18. Seven-week course alternatives	Y	N	E	G	F	U	DK	G	S	N	NA	Neg
19. Housing accommodations availability	Y	N	E	G	F	U	DK	G	S	N	NA	Neg
20. Fast computer registration	Y	N	E	G	F	U	DK	G	S	N	NA	Neg
21. The city of Oshkosh's cultural, recreational and employment opportunities	Y	N	E	G	F	U	DK	G	S	N	NA	Neg
22. Opportunities for college courses taught at high schools	Y	N	E	G	F	U	DK	G	S	N	NA	Neg
23. College courses available at nearby public library	Y	N	E	G	F	U	DK	G	S	N	NA	Neg
24. Open admissions	Y	N	E	G	F	U	DK	G	S	N	NA	Neg
25. 4-week summer course alternatives	Y	N	E	G	F	U	DK	G	S	N	NA	Neg

THANK YOU.

APPENDIX C-6

STUDENT LEARNING DATA

GRADES IN EDUCATIONAL MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION (387/587), SPRING TERM, 1977 FROM SAME FINAL EXAMINATION

(Instructor A)

	7-Week		14-Week	
	N	%	N	%
A	13	52	8	22
B	8	32	18	49
C	4	16	8	22
D	0	0	3	8
F	0	0	0	0
W	0	0	2	5
I	0	0	0	0
	25	100	37	101

GRADES AND STUDENT COURSE EVALUATIONS IN EDUCATIONAL MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION (387/587), 1975 AND 1976: FINAL EXAMINATIONS FROM SAME ITEM POOL

(Instructor B)

	14-Week (Fall, 1975)		3-Week (January, 1976)		1st 7-Week (Spring, 1976)		2nd 7-Week (Spring, 1976)	
Grades	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A	12	35	16	41	13	36	9	19
B	15	44	23	59	21	58	24	51
C	4	12	0	0	2	6	12	26
D	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
F	3	9	0	0	0	0	1	2
	34	100	39	100	36	100	47	100
Student Course Rating*	4.26		4.20		4.30		4.24	

---

* On a scale of 1 to 5, 5 being the high score

GRADES IN FRENCH 101, 1975-1976

	7-Week		14-Week	
Grades	N	%	N	%
A	4	57	2	18
B	1	14	4	36
C	2	29	3	27
D	0	0	2	18
F	0	0	0	0
	7	100	11	99

APPENDIX C-7a

OSHKOSH CITIZENS SURVEY

Appendix C-7

There are two surveys, each conducted by a team of four students in Spring, 1977. The students were enrolled in a course in Marketing Research with Professor Ron Marks.

The first ("Attitudes Towards the University by Oshkosh Residents") was done by telephone interviews. The population was from a stratified random sample by 1970 SMSA family income census tracts. A good response rate and a careful sample provide confidence in the results summarized in the computer print-out following the questionnaire.

The second ("High School Seniors' Attitudes Toward UW-O") was a questionnaire administered in a private high school. The poor return rate and a sample biased toward higher income families (over 60% have incomes over $20,000) mean that any inferences drawn from the reported data require considerable qualifications.

Attitudes towards the University by Oshkosh Residents

1. Have you ever heard of the "University of Alternatives?"
   - a) yes
   - b) no

2. Have you ever attended the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh?
   - a) no
   - b) presently
   - c) 1-10 years ago
   - d) 11 years ago or more

3. Are you familiar with the 3, 7, 14-week calendar at UWO?
   - a) know nothing about it
   - b) have heard about it
   - c) know alot about it

4. Do you feel that this calendar provides an opportunity for a better education?
   - a) very much
   - b) some
   - c) a little
   - d) none
   - e) no opinion

5. Do you come into contact with UWO students?
   - a) often
   - b) occasionally
   - c) never

6. Would you consider taking a course at the University?
   - a) yes
   - b) no
   - c) maybe

7. Do you feel that the University has an impact on Oshkosh?
   - a) positive impact
   - b) no impact
   - c) negative impact

8. How do you feel towards the faculty at UWO?
   - a) very favorable
   - b) favorable
   - c) neither favorable nor unfavorable
   - d) unfavorable
   - e) very unfavorable

9. In the past year have you attended any activities sponsored by the University such as sports activities, plays, movies, etc?
   - a) regularly
   - b) occasionally
   - c) seldom
   - d) never

10. How do you feel towards the students at UWO?
   - a) very favorable
   - b) favorable
   - c) neither favorable nor unfavorable
   - d) unfavorable
   - e) very unfavorable

11. How far do you live from the University?
   - a) less than one mile
   - b) 1-3 miles
   - c) 4-7 miles
   - d) 8 miles or more

12. Would you recommend the University to a family member or friend?
   - a) yes
   - b) no
   - c) might

13. How do you feel towards UWO?
    - a) very favorable
    - b) favorable
    - c) neither favorable nor unfavorable
    - d) unfavorable
    - e) very unfavorable

14. Do you have any friends that are UWO faculty members?
    - a) yes
    - b) no

15. What do you feel is the value of thestudents to the city of Oshkosh?
    - a) great value
    - b) moderate value
    - c) little value
    - d) no value

16. How long have you lived in Oshkosh?
    - a) less than one year
    - b) 1-5 years
    - c) over 5 years

17. Sex
    - a) male
    - b) female

18. What is your age?
    - a) 18-25
    - b) 26-35
    - c) 36-45
    - d) 46-55
    - e) over 55

19. How many years of education have you completed?
    - a) less than high school
    - b) High school graduate
    - c) some college or technical school
    - d) college graduate or more

20. What is your annual income?

a) less that $7,000
b) $7,000 - $12,000
c) $12,001 - $16,000
d) $16,001 - $21,000
e) greater than $21,000

21. What is your occupation? ______________________

THANK-YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION!

```
SINGLE OPTION FREQUENCY TABULATION
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - OSHKOSH
COMPUTER SERVICES - SS2200
REPORT DATE:  APRIL 29, 1977

EXCLUDED VALUES  1  VALUES 0
LABELS     A   = 1     B   = 2     C   = 3     D   = 4     E   = 5
OPSCAN CARDS DECODED
SAMPLE SIZE:        124           FREQUENCY TABLE

                               ******* RON MARKS ******* METHOD I *******
QUES     CARD
 NO.     NO. COL.  BLANK      A        B         C         D         E        N   MEAN  MODE  ST.DEV.

  1        1   41   1.00    40.00    83.00                                   123  1.67   2     0.47
  2        1   42   1.00    84.00    20.00    17.00      2.00                123  1.49   1     0.79
  3        1   43   1.00    47.00    50.00    26.00                          123  1.83   2     0.75
  4        1   44   2.00    14.00    28.00    16.00      2.00     62.00      122  3.57   5     1.55
  5        1   45   1.00    46.00    56.00    18.00                3.00      123  1.85   2     0.85
  6        1   46   1.00    50.00    37.00    36.00                          123  1.89   1     0.83
  7        1   47   2.00   101.00    13.00     8.00                          122  1.24   1     0.56
  8        1   48   1.00     9.00    52.00    56.00      5.00      1.00      123  2.49   3     0.73
  9        1   49   1.00     7.00    58.00    28.00     29.00      1.00      123  2.67   2     0.93
 10        1   50   1.00    14.00    67.00    26.00     15.00      1.00      123  2.37   2     0.87
 11        1   51   1.00    32.00    68.00    21.00      2.00                123  1.94   2     0.70
 12        1   52   1.00   100.00     6.00    17.00                          123  1.33   1     0.70
 13        1   53   1.00    13.00    83.00    25.00      1.00      1.00      123  2.14   2     0.63
 14        1   54   1.00    39.00    83.00     1.00                          123  1.69   2     0.48
 15        1   55   1.00    27.00    80.00    11.00      5.00                123  1.95   2     0.68
 16        1   56   1.00     5.00    30.00    88.00                          123  2.67   3     0.55
 17        1   57   2.00    45.00    76.00     1.00                          122  1.64   2     0.50
 18        1   58   2.00    28.00    34.00    14.00     24.00     22.00      122  2.82   2     1.44
 19        1   59   1.00    10.00    48.00    49.00     16.00                123  2.58   3     0.82
 20        1   60   3.00    26.00    38.00    38.00     16.00      3.00      121  2.44   2     1.04

TABLE TOTALS       26.00   737.00  1010.00   496.00    117.00     94.00     2454  2.11   2     1.01
```

APPENDIX C-7b

HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS SURVEY

This a survey on the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh. This survey is part of our class assignment for Marketing Research at UW-O. There are no right or wrong answers to this survey. We appreciate you taking your time and filling out this survey.

1) Do you plan on attending college?

A) Yes
B) No

2) Have you considered attending UW-O?

A) Yes
B) No

3) How do you rank UW-O in comparison to other University of Wisconsin campuses?

A) Superior
B) Good
C) Average
D) Below Average
E) Low

4) How do your parents feel about UW-O as an educational institution?

A) Superior
B) Good
C) Average
D) Below Average
E) Low

5) How much influence has your high school guidance counselor had in your selection of a university?

A) Alot of influence
B) Some influence
C) Little influence
D) Very little influence
E) No influence

6) How often have you met with your high school guidance counselor to receive information on colleges?

A) 1-2 times
B) 3-4 times
C) 5 or more times
D) Zero times

7) Which of the following majors offered at UW-O do you feel is a superior program?

A) Nursing
B) Business Administration
C) Education (Teaching)
D) Physical Education
E) Science

8) Which of the following do you intend to major in?

A) Nursing
B) Business Administration
C) Education (Teaching)
D) Physical Education
E) Science

9) How do you plan on financing your college education?

A) Financial aids (Loans, Grants)
B) Parents
C) Work way through
D) Through savings
E) By a combination of the above

10) What do you feel is the appropiate high school preparation for a Business Administration major?

A) Math and English
B) Accounting
C) Economics
D) An overall general curriculum
E) Don't know

11) Do you feel that UW-O is a party school?

A) Strongly disagree
B) Disagree
C) No opinion
D) Agree
E) Strongly agree

12) Are you aware of the difference between the UW-O calendar year and other University of Wisconsin colleges calender year?

A) Yes
B) No

If you answered NO to question 12 go to question 15.

13) How did you find out about the new UW-O calender semester?

A) Counselor
B) Newspapers
C) Friends
D) Teachers
E) Other______________________________

14) How would you rank the 14 week semester at UW-O to other Universities 17 week semesters?

A) Not as good
B) Just as good
C) Better

15) What is your Grade Point Average (GPA)?

A) 1.00-1.99
B) 2.00-2.49
C) 2.50-2.99
D) 3.00-3.49
E) 3.50-4.00

16) What is your fathers educational background?

A) Grade school graduate
B) High school graduate
C) 2 year college graduate
D) Technical school graduate
E) 4 year college graduate

17) What is your mothers educational background?

A) Grade school graduate
B) High school graduate
C) 2 year college graduate
D) Technical school graduate
E) 4 year college graduate

18) Which of the following best describes your family employment situation?

A) Father works
B) Mother works
C) Neither work
D) Both work

19) What is your family income?

A) $0-$4,999
B) $5,000-$9,999
C) $10,000-$14,999
D) $15,000-$19,999
E) $20,000 or above

THANK YOU

```
SINGLE COLUMN FREQUENCY TABULATION
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - OSHKOSH
COMPUTER SERVICES - SSP20D
REPORT DATE:  MAY  3, 1977

EXCLUDED VALUES  1  VALUES 0
LABELS        A    = 1     B    = 2     C    = 3     D    = 4     E    = 5
OPSCAN CARDS DECODED
SAMPLE SIZE:          31          PERCENTAGE TABLE,   TABULATIONS FOR EXCLUDED VALUES ARE SHOWN AS FREQUENCIES

                                  RCN MARKS    GROUP 11

QUES      CARD
 NO.    NO. COL.   BLANK       A          B          C          D          E         N    MEAN  MODE   ST.DEV.

  1       1   41             70.96      29.03                                      31    1.29    1       0.45
  2       1   42             58.06      41.93                                      31    1.42    1       0.49
  3       1   43              3.22      54.83      41.93                           31    2.39    2       0.55
  4       1   44              3.22      67.74      22.58       6.45                31    2.32    2       0.64
  5       1   45                        29.03      22.58      22.58      25.80     31    3.45    2       1.16
  6       1   46             25.80      38.70      29.03       6.45                31    2.16    2       0.88
  7       1   47    1.00      9.99      56.66      16.66       6.66       9.99     30    2.50    2       1.09
  8       1   48    1.00     16.66      29.99      23.33       3.33      26.66     30    2.93    2       1.44
  9       1   49    1.00     16.66      29.99       6.66       6.66      39.99     30    3.23    5       1.61
 10       1   50              9.67      19.35       6.45      51.61      12.90     31    3.39    4       1.21
 11       1   51                        32.25      38.70      19.35       9.67     31    3.06    3       0.95
 12       1   52             32.25      67.74                                      31    1.68    2       0.47
 13       1   53   13.00     11.11      11.11      38.88      11.11      27.77     18    3.33    3       1.29
 14       1   54   17.00                50.00      42.85       7.14                14    2.57    2       0.62
 15       1   55    1.00      3.33       9.99      39.99      36.66       9.99     30    3.40    3       0.92
 16       1   56              9.67      38.70       6.45       6.45      38.70     31    3.26    2       1.52
 17       1   57             12.90      51.61       6.45       3.22      25.80     31    2.77    2       1.43
 18       1   58             45.16       3.22       3.22      45.16       3.22     31    2.58    1       1.50
 19       1   59    4.00                 7.40      18.51      14.81      59.25     27    4.26    5       1.00

 TABLE TOTALS     38.00     18.15      35.57      17.97      13.25      15.06    551    2.72    2       1.32
```

589